THE TRADITIONS OF PURITAN TYPOLOGY

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Thomas M. Davis
June, 1968

Leon T. Dickinson Dissertation Supervisor

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, have examined a thesis entitled

THE TRADITIONS OF PURITAN TYPOLOGY

presented by Thomas M. Davis

a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Leon T. Dickinson

Dick A. Renner

Allen F. Davis

Dr. Thomas M. Davis
University of Missouri - Columbia
Doctor of Philosophy
June 4, 1968

THE TRADITIONS OF PURITAN TYPOLOGY

by

Thomas M. Davis

Dr. Leon T. Dickinson Dissertation Supervisor

Abstract

Central to much of Puritan writing is a traditional method of relating the Old and New Testaments called typology. Certain Old Testament persons and events (types) were viewed as prefiguring corresponding New Testament persons and events (antitypes). Although a number of critics have briefly commented on Puritan typology, none has recognized how extensively typological imagery appears in Puritan literature, nor how complex are the traditions of medieval art and literature which inform the Puritan use of the typical image. Moreover, because the Catholic and Protestant typological traditions have not been studied in relation to Puritan typology, some critics have misinterpreted Puritan attitudes, and others have not identified the type-antitype construct as the dominating image of the work in question. The purpose of this study, then, is to trace the development of typological interpretations from New Testament authors to English and Colonial

Puritans, indicating how typological traditions culminate in Puritan literature.

Typology originated in the messianic prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures; Christian writers simply incorporated traditional Jewish themes within the evolving Christian creed. Many of the early Church Fathers utilized typology as a means of establishing the corpus of Christian dogma, although differing views of the importance of the typical event led to the creation of opposing critical schools, one in Antioch and one in Alexandria. The Alexandrians, under the leadership of Origen, became the major influence in the development of hermeneutic principles; through the work of Jerome and Augustine, Origen's allegorical interpretations, which subordinated typology to allegory, were extended throughout medieval art and literature.

Because of the visual qualities of type-antitype identifications, individual typological representations appeared in the earliest Christian art forms. As early as the fourth century, complex typological series were executed in mosaics and woodcarvings, and in later centuries, stone and stained glass. By the twelfth century, typological motifs had become a major part of church decoration. Extensive type-antitype series were incorporated in the stained glass windows of Chartres, Canterbury, and, by the early sixteenth century, in the more than 100 balancing type-antitype panels of King's College Chapel, Cambridge. In addition, much of the manuscript illumination was typologically oriented; widely circulated "pictorial" versions of the Bible, such as the _Biblia_ _Pauperum_, were based upon a typological representation of the incidents in Christ's life. The last major pictorial use of typology occurred in the early emblem books, although by the first decades of the seventeenth century, types were largely subordinated to Christian allegory.

Although Protestant theologians condemned the allegorical interpretations of Patristic commentators, typology was a central part of the hermeneutics of Tyndale, Luther, Calvin, the Dutch theologian Johannes Cocceius, and other Protestant authors widely read by the Puritans. In Calvin's thought particularly, typology occupied a central role; for Calvin's view of the relationship of the Old and New Testaments was based primarily upon a typological reading of the Scriptures. Hence, by the seventeenth century, typology was a widely practiced Protestant exegetical method: several studies, such as Thomas Taylor's _Moses_ _and_ _Aaron_ (London: 1635) and Samuel Mather's _The_ _Figures_ _or_ _Types_ _of_ _the_ _Old_ _Testament_ (London: 1673), devoted solely to typological identifications, appeared and were widely read. Of New England artists, Edward Taylor was perhaps the most knowledgeable about typology and the most influenced by its traditions: for more than ten years he devoted his Meditations to typical subjects. Even Jonathan Edwards, with whom the historical traditions of typology cease, partially utilized a theory of types as the basis of the symbolic view of nature presented in the Images or Shadows of Divine Things.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For the original suggestion for this study, and for continued encouragement and direction, I am indebted to Dr. Leon T. Dickinson, to whom I wish to express my special gratitude. I wish also to thank Professor Dick A. Renner, who read and corrected the manuscript, and Professors Willoughby Johnson and Charles M.Hudson, who have provided encouragement throughout the years I have worked on this study.

I am also indebted to the Graduate School of the University of Missouri for a grant which enabled me to obtain necessary assistance in translations; to Professor Meiner Rheinhold for his Latin scholarship; to Professor Cleatus Hinds, whose knowledge of *koiné* Greek has been invaluable; to Professor Alan Cohn, Humanities Librarian of Southern Illinois University; and to Mrs. Joan Fricks and Mrs. Nancy Gillespie for their careful preparation of the manuscript. Finally, I owe a good deal to my wife.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER

I. THE ORIGINS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF TYPOLOGY . 52

II. TYPOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND RENAISSANCE . 134

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PURITAN TYPOLOGY 223

IV. TYPOLOGY IN EDWARD TAYLOR AND JONATHAN EDWARDS 337

BIBLIOGRAPHY 392

INTRODUCTION

> . . . God hath shown by the exodus from Egypt, by the passage of the sea, by the defeat of the Kings, by the manna, by the genealogy of Abraham, that He was able to save, to send down the heavenly bread. . . . So, in a word He has taught us that all these things were but types. . . .
>
> Pascal, _Pensées_, 527

One of the most pervasive images in the literature of New England Puritanism is the Exodus metaphor of the "wilderness." One finds it everywhere throughout the first century of Puritan writing. Recalling the hardships of that first winter in Plymouth, William Bradford notes:

> _Our faithers were English men which came over this great ocean, and were ready to perish in this willdernes. . . . When they wandered in the deserte . . . willderness out of the way, and found no citie to dwell in, both hungrie, and thirstie, their sowle was overwhelmed in them._[1]

Edward Johnson, writing under the burden of defending the New England Way, praises the dedication of the Puritans, who

> forsooke a fruitfull Land, stately Building, goodly Gardens, Orchards, yea, deare Friends, and neere relations, to goe to a desart Wilderness, thousands of leagues by Sea, both turbulent and dangerous. . . .[2]

---

[1] William Bradford, _History of Plymouth Plantation: 1620-1647_, ed. Worthington C. Ford (Boston: 1912), I, 156-57.

[2] Edward Johnson, _Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour in New-England: 1628-1651_, ed. J. Franklin Jameson (New York: 1910), pp. 21-22.

Later still, in Cotton Mather's celebration of the "acts" of God's New England Elect, the broader aspects of the image are stated, including the supreme example of Christian testing, as well as the wilderness experience of the Hebrew people:

> It is written concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, "that he was led into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil;" and the people of the Lord Jesus Christ, "led into the wilderness" of New-England, have . . . met with a continual _temptation_ of the devil there. . . .[3]

Peter Gay may be partially correct when he asserts that, by the time of Cotton Mather, the image had become a "rather self-indulgent metaphor";[4] but neither he nor other New England historians have recognized how deeply imbedded in the Puritan consciousness such imagery was, nor how complete was the Puritans' identification of themselves with the Exodus cultus, and, more broadly, with the central myths which inform Hebrew history.

In discussing Samuel Danforth's election day sermon, _A Brief Recognition of New England's Errand into the Wilderness_, Perry Miller, for example, focuses primarily upon the increasing number of jeremiads (of which Danforth's is one), which are "castigations of the people for having defaulted" on the original terms of the covenant agreement, the agreement which brought them on their "errand into the wilderness."[5] In his analysis of the relation of the wilderness image to history and biography in Puritan New England, Kenneth Murdock suggests that the Puritan's attitude toward

---

[3] Cotton Mather, _Magnalia Christi Americana_, ed. Thomas Robbins (Hartford: 1853), II, 490.

[4] Peter Gay, _A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America_ (Berkeley: 1966), p. 29n. Gay notes that he has counted the use of the wilderness metaphor "94 times in Cotton Mather's _Magnalia Christi Americana_, and I am sure I have missed several uses. 'Wilderness' became an all-purpose, and hence almost meaningless, metaphor. . . ."

> these types of writing may have been his feeling that not only did he live in critical times and share the problems which beset his nonconformist brethren everywhere, but also [that] he faced peculiar crises of his own, arising from his "wilderness condition. . . ."[6]

Bradford's little-known rhymed history of New England is a representative contemporary statement of the general significance of this aspect of the wilderness imagery:

> . . . If thou has view'd the camp of Israel,
> How God in the wilderness with them did dwell;
> And led them long in that dangerous place,
> Through fears and trials for so long a space;
> And yet they never saw more of his glory,
> Than in this time where he advanced them high.
> His great and marvellous works they here saw,
> And he them taught, in his most holy law.
> A small emblem hereof thou mayest see,
> How God hath dealt with these [the Puritans],
> in some degree;

---

[5] Perry Miller, Errand into the Wilderness (Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1964), p. 6.

[6] Kenneth B. Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness: History and Biography in Puritan New England," Church History (September, 1955), XXIV, 223.

For much of himself they now here have seen,
And marvellous to them his works have been.[7]

On the other hand, Alan Heimert would seem to be incorrect when, viewing the "wilderness" in relation to Frederick Jackson Turner's "frontier" thesis, he concludes that the Puritans' concept "of the American 'wilderness'. . . was not, as it were, carried to America on the Mayflower or the Arbella, but came out of that wilderness itself."[8] It may be true, as Heimert notes, that later New Englanders, particularly the eighteenth century historians, interpret the term in the sense of "frontier," reflecting the increasing awareness of the Indian problem and of the difficulties in civilizing back-country areas; yet for the earliest settlers, and even for Cotton Mather, the wilderness image was a multi-level analogy which had its roots in the experiences of the Hebrew nation--not in the forests of New England. It is a concept which looks to the past--to Adam, Abraham, Moses, Joshua, and others--for its essential meaning. When Cotton Mather notes, for example, that New England is "the almost only Garden, which our Lord Jesus has in the vast continent of

---

[7] William Bradford, "A Descriptive and Historical Account of New England in Verse," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston: 1810), III, 80-81.

[8] Alan Heimert, "Puritanism, the Wilderness, and the Frontier," New England Quarterly (September, 1953), XXVI, 361.

America,"[9] he is not modifying in any substantial way the earlier attitudes toward the wilderness; on the contrary, he is simply restating an analogical commonplace which unites the Garden of Eden, the Jewish tabernacle, Solomon's *hortus conclusus*, and the Garden of Gethsemane.

Although a number of critics have commented on the widespread use of the wilderness image, most of them have viewed such imagery as a simple analogy, comparing the Puritans' experiences in New England with only the post-Exodus experiences of the Hebrew people. Commenting upon John Higginson's citation of Moses's final adjurations to the Jews, for example, Murdock expresses the usual critical interpretation of the wilderness metaphor: "This plea to the Children of Israel . . . to remember the testing God had subjected them to in the wilderness . . . applied perfectly, as Higginson saw it, to the New Englanders."[10] But the image is much more complex; the wilderness metaphor is only one aspect of God's actions in history and their relationship to the Puritan experience.

When Bradford writes, for example, that "*our faithers were* . . . *ready to perish in this willdernes* . . . [, for] *they wandered in the deserte* . . . *willderness* . . . *and found no citie to dwell in* . . . ," his comment seems to be perfectly straightforward, contrasting the wildness of New England with the comforts of homeland which have been left behind. On the other hand, one must think that, in some sense, the statement is redundant; for it is so obvious that in a "deserte willderness" one would not likely find "cities," that to mention them seems superfluous. Bradford, however, is alluding to a relationship between the wilderness and cities which has not been identified by critics of New England Puritanism, but which would have been quite clear to his contemporaries. The same is true of John Winthrop's famous statement of the purpose for which the Puritans came to New England. The wilderness image is not specifically referred to, although Winthrop's awareness of the significance of the wilderness provides a backdrop against which he frames his theory of state and society. If the little band keeps faith with the God of the covenant, they shall find, Winthrop says,

---

[9] Cited in Heimert, p. 370.

[10] Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness," p. 221.

> That the God of Israell is among us, when tenn of us shall be able to resist a thousand of our enemies, when hee shall make us a prayse and glory, that men shall say of succeeding plantacions: the lord make it like that of New England: for we must Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the eies of all people are uppon us. . . .[11]

"Winthrop's expression," as Darrett Rutman points out,

---

[11] John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," Winthrop Papers (Boston: 1931), II, 294-95.

"was much more than a literary conceit borrowed from the Gospel of Matthew";[12] it represented a determined attempt to found a Christian commonwealth, devoted only to God and His ends; a "Citty upon a Hill" which was _de civitate dei_. Yet Rutman does not point out that the image involves more than the direct statement of Matthew 5: 12, "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid."[13] Neither in "A Modell of Christian Charity," where the background of the wilderness is only implied, nor in _A History of Plymouth Plantation_, where cities and wilderness are specifically related, have critics identified fully the frame of reference in the authors' minds.

---

[12] Darrett B. Rutman, _Winthrop's Boston: Portrait of a Puritan Town: 1630-1649_ (Chapel Hill: 1965), p. 4.

[13] Except where specifically noted, I use the King James Version as the text for scriptural citations. Zoltan Haraszti's study of the use of different versions of the Bible, in his analysis of the _Bay Psalm Book_, indicates that the 1611 edition is the predominant text: "Those of the younger generation, who had received their education after the publication of the King James Version in 1611, adopted exclusively this text. Thus the writings of Richard Mather, John Eliot, Thomas Shephard, John Norton, and their contemporaries have no trace of the Geneva Bible. The older men, on the other hand, used both the Geneva Bible and the King James Version, but in varying proportions" (_The Enigma of the Bay Psalm Book_ [Chicago: 1956], p. 36). In each case, however, where the specific wording of a text is central to my analysis, I have checked the KJV against the Geneva Edition. When neither text seems to be the source of a specific citation, I assume that the author under discussion has made his own translation. Such is often the case, for example, in Samuel Mather's _The Figures or Types of the Old Testament_.

And the same is true in numerous other instances, involving not only the wilderness citations, but other biblical images as well.

The "Citty upon a Hill" which Winthrop intended to found and the "citie" which Bradford looked for in the wilderness are allusions to a promise which God made to his covenanted people, first to Abraham, then to his descendants, and, ultimately, to all those who enter into a covenantal agreement with Him. The original covenant which God made with Adam was abrogated by Adam's disobedience; God, in His mercy, entered into a second contractual agreement with Abraham. One aspect of the original agreement with Abraham, which was reaffirmed to each succeeding prophet, priest, or king, was, as the author of Hebrews records, the promise of a "city":

> By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.
>
> By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise:
>
> For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.[14]

---

[14] Hebrews 11: 8-10. For a recent analysis of the reaffirmation of the covenant relationship throughout the major periods of Hebrew history, see Gerhard von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," Essays

It is misleading to say, as Herbert Schneider does, that the Puritans "discovered the general similarity between themselves and the ancient Israelites" after they had settled in New England.[15] The parallels of the immigrating groups with the Israelites were fully established before concrete plans were made for removal to New England.[16] In his study of John Winthrop, Edmund Morgan also indicates that such relationships were a part of the Puritan consciousness from the beginning:

> [God] had sealed a covenant with them and given them a special responsibility to carry out the good intentions that had brought them into the wilderness. . . . They must not allow any selfish private motives to interfere with their plan, for though every society must make its covenant with God, they had been singled out, like Israel of old, to serve as a model for others.[17]

In describing the departure of the Pilgrims from Holland, Bradford identifies in a note, and in calling the group "Pilgrims," the specific source of city imagery:

---

on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed. Claus Westermann (Richmond, Virginia: 1963), pp. 25ff.

[15] Herbert W. Schneider, The Puritan Mind (Ann Arbor: 1958), p. 26.

[16] See, for example, Peter Y. DeJong's study of the importance of the covenant idea in English and Dutch Puritans, in The Covenant Idea in New England Theology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1945), pp. 63ff. Emerson's comment that "in Puritanism . . . the whole Jewish history became flesh and blood" is, despite its exaggeration, a truer estimate (Works [Boston: 1886], p. 234).

[17] Edmund S. Morgan, The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop (Boston: 1958), p. 70.

> So they lefte the goodly and pleasante citie, which had been ther resting place near ·12· years; but they knew they were pilgrimes, and looked not much on those things, but lift up their eyes to the heavens, their dearest cuntrie. . . . [18]

In using the term "pilgrimes," Bradford is simply quoting from the Epistle to the Hebrews, for Abraham and his descendants were "strangers and pilgrims on earth," who desired a better country, "that is an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of them to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a citie."[19]

Further, the connection of the "city" with the wilderness metaphor involves more than an earthly city, as Bradford notes, for the purgative experiences in the wilderness qualified the children of Israel for habitation in a "holy city," the Jerusalem of the land of Canaan, and, ultimately, the "new Jerusalem" of Bradford's "dearest countrie." The promise of a city which was made to Abraham was later incorporated in the re-establishment of the covenant with Moses. After God destroyed the Egyptian hosts in the Red Sea, in a "Song of Deliverance" Moses praises His mercy: "Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed: thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation" (Exodus 15: 13). Or, as the writer of Hebrews, contrasting the city of the Christian dispensation with Moses's "holy habitation," explains: "But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. . ." (13: 22). This is the Jerusalem of Revelations, "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (21: 2). Underlying the conception of a city on a hill is, of course, the primitive's identification of the "holy habitation" with mountains (Sion, Ararat, Sinai, the Mount of Transfiguration) and, particularly for the Hebrew faith, the tribal leader's vision of the earthly Jerusalem, a city on a hill, and, ultimately, the heavenly city which St. John records in his revelation.

---

[18] Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation, I, 124. Nathaniel Morton also identifies the relationship between the city and wilderness. In recounting the Pilgrims' departure from Holland, he notes that they followed in the path of "Moses and the Israelites when they went out of Egypt." He then identifies the text for the farewell sermon, Hebrews 11: 16: "God hath prepared for them a city" (New England's Memorial [Boston: 1826], p. 23).

[19] Hebrews 11: 13, 16, Geneva Edition (London: 1583). In the KJV, the phrase "strangers and pilgrims on earth" is the same; the rest of the citation, however, indicates that Bradford is citing from the Geneva Edition.

Although there are other ramifications of the wilderness image, [20] the clear relationship of city imagery with the wilderness metaphor indicates that New England Puritans have a peculiar and widespread structure of imagery which informs much of their writing and which has been little noted by critics of Puritanism. Associated with their particular view of the providential theory of history, with their specific doctrinal biases which caused them to depend upon the Old Testament for authority in doctrine and church polity, and with the special commitment of New England Puritanism to covenant theology, is a method of biblical exegesis called typology, the

---

[20] In addition to the relationships between the promised city and the wilderness imagery, light imagery is also associated with the city, for Winthrop's allusion to the "Cittie on a Hill" of Matthew 5: 14, is related to the following verse, "Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick. . . ." The candlestick imagery relates the passage to the golden candlesticks of the Temple, and of the Book of Revelations.

Finally, as the imagery returns full circle, the golden candlestick represents the faith of the Chosen People (for example, in Exodus 25: 31, and 37: 17). For a discussion of Cotton Mather's use of the candlestick imagery, see Sacvan Bercovitch, "New England Epic: Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*," *ELH* (September, 1966), XXXIII, 340ff.

The Puritan concept of a "calling" is also related to the wilderness experience, to the special covenant which God makes with his Chosen, and to the "call" to be a "city of God." As Winthrop makes clear in "A Modell of Christian Charity," the Puritans must found a godly state in New England for they had received a special summons from God for this experiment, a summons which is codified in the covenant relationship. For a discussion of the Puritan attitudes toward a "calling," see *Puritan Political Ideas: 1558-1794*, ed. Edmund S. Morgan (Indianapolis: 1965), pp. xv-xx, and William Perkins' essay included in the same volume, "A Treatise of the Vocations or Callings of men" (pp. 35-59).

Finally, for an extended contemporary analysis of the significance of Old Testament city imagery as it prefigures the church (the *ecclesia*--"the called out ones") see Benjamin Keach, *Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors* (London: 1682), Book IV, pp. 76ff. Keach lists twenty parallels between the city of the Old Testament and the church in the New. One of the scriptural "establishment of historical connexions between certain events, persons or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons or things in the New Testament."[21] Such a view of the relationship of the Old and New Testaments makes possible the Puritans' simultaneous identification of the city with the wilderness image at any point in biblical history. Like the evolution of the ancient ballads, each "event, person, or thing" in the Old Testament develops by accretion numerous levels of relationships, all of which may be brought to bear in a single image. Further, as in the case of wilderness imagery, a single image may not be fully understood, or may even be misinterpreted, if these traditional relationships are not considered in evaluating the total meaning of the image. Such a "simultaneous view" of biblical history is the central principle of the typological method of exegesis; further, parallels from non-biblical sources may also be included, broadening even more the ramifications of the imagery. In the case of Winthrop's "Cittie on a Hill," for example, St.

---

headnotes presented as authority for identifying the biblical references to cities with the church is, of course, Matthew 5: 14: "Ye are a City set on a Hill. . . ."

[21] G. W. H. Lampe, "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," Essays on Typology, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22 (April, 1957), p. 39.

Augustine's de civitate dei is undoubtedly a part of the context of meaning, as well as the biblical allusions.[22]

Although several critics have commented briefly on the importance of typology in New England thought,[23] and Perry Miller has suggested that "a study of the revival of typology . . . during the seventeenth century would . . . make a substantial contribution" to the understanding of Puritan literature,[24] apart from Miller's own brief analysis in his introduction to Jonathan Edwards' Images or Shadows of Divine Things, only one critic has dealt in any extended way with the study of typology, Ursula Brumm, in Die Religiöse Typologie im Amerikanischen Denken. Miss Brumm's primary concern, following the methodology of Ernst Cassirer and Susanne Langer, is to establish a Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen to account for the aesthetics of Hawthorne and Melville. The purpose of her study is to show "how symbolic representation and applications of the American classicists have developed from the forms of Puritan thought and belief."[25] The focus of her study is different from the major concerns of my investigation, for Miss Brumm is interested, in much the same way as is Charles Feidelson, Jr. in _Symbolism and American Literature_, in Puritan literature as it "foreshadows" Hawthorne and Melville. Miss Brumm analyzes Puritan writing in the context of what its ultimate aesthetic influence is on nineteenth century American literature. The major concern of this study, on the other hand, is to investigate typology in the framework of the religious and humanistic traditions from which it emerged, and to view it primarily in relation to seventeenth century Puritanism. This is not to say that an understanding of typology does not inform the aesthetic creed of Hawthorne and Melville, and of Emerson as well. In its broader symbolic aspects it does. But theirs is not the typology of the Puritans, because it has been stripped of the historical context which gave it meaning, and because it no longer possesses the intimate connection with theological dogma which imposed limitations upon the Puritans' use of the typological symbol.

---

[22] For an extended discussion of Augustine's influence in New England Puritanism, see Perry Miller, "The Augustinian Strain of Piety," The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (New York: 1939), I, 3-34.

[23] See Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness," pp. 234-36; Peter Gay, A Loss of Mastery, pp. 96-97; Perry Miller, Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition (Indianapolis: 1953), pp. 33-43; Alan Simpson, Puritanism in Old and New England (Chicago: 1955), pp. 47-53; Charles Feidelson, Jr., Symbolism and American Literature (Chicago: 1953), pp. 83-101; and Sacvan Bercovitch, "Typology in Puritan New England: The Williams-Cotton Controversy Reassessed," American Quarterly (Summer, 1967), XIX, 166-191.

[24] Perry Miller, "Introduction," Images or Shadows of Divine Things (New Haven: 1948), pp. 141-42.

---

[25] Ursula Brumm, "Fragestellung," _Die Religiöse Typologie im Amerikanischen Denken_ (Leiden: 1963), p. 4.

While one cannot deny the validity of Miss Brumm's approach, nor disregard her clearly stated intention to investigate Puritan literature for those characteristics which inform later American literature, one must point out that there are obvious dangers to this approach to Puritan writing. Too often critics use New England writing as source texts to support an interpretation of nineteenth or twentieth century authors; and, upon finding that the texts do not supply the relevant data, condemn the Puritans for being insensitive to literary aesthetics. Charles Feidelson's assertion that "the wearisome reiteration of 'providences' in the Puritan writings is actually a record of symbolic experience that never attained formal literary structure"[26] reflects his distaste for allegory generally and for the allegorical character of the providences themselves; further, his comment indicates that his view of what constitutes the "symbolic" is too limited to acknowledge the Puritan conviction that these events are symbolic in a special sense of God's intervention in history. Judged by Feidelson's standards, Puritans are _symbolistes manqués_; as Miss Brumm correctly observes, such a judgment is "basically ahistoric ideology which camouflages basic differences of form and content of thinking."[27]

---

[26] _Symbolism and American Literature_, p. 81.

In addition to condemning Puritan writing on the basis of modern aesthetic principles, there is a second misuse of Puritan literature which detracts from its value by overemphasizing its modernity. In attempts to salvage Puritan thought and make it palatable to the modern temper, critics have discovered in the literature certain humanistic traditions, which, while they may be there, simply did not have the force to the Puritans which critics make them have to the modern reader. I shall refer in later chapters to Perry Miller's study of Jonathan Edwards as illustrating this tendency in modern criticism. My point here is that any study of Puritan thought which uses it as a means to a later and more modern end is valid only insofar as one recognizes, for example, that when Hawthorne calls Father Hooper's black veil a "type," using the term as synonymous with "emblem" and "symbol," that this is not the sense in which Puritans use the term.[28] Further, any reading of a story such as "The

---

[27] Brumm, p. 14.

[28] Nathaniel Hawthorne, "The Minister's Black Veil," The Complete Novels and Selected Tales of Nathaniel Hawthorne, ed. Norman Holmes Pearson (New York: 1937), p. 878. It is in the dialogue with Elizabeth that Father Hooper calls the veil a "type and a symbol"; and, in the same scene, Hawthorne, through the consciousness of Hooper notes: "Mr. Hooper smiled to think that only a

Minister's Black Veil" should acknowledge that, imaginative as is Father Hooper's action and Hawthorne's presentation of it, no Puritan minister in the early days of Milford Village would make this symbolic gesture. One has only to remember the Puritan strictures concerning Anglican vestments or any material object which focuses attention on the creature, thereby detracting from the Creator, to see that Hawthorne's re-creation of the scene is in itself symbolic in a way the Puritan would never be.

Further, a study of typology in its historical context is a desideratum because several critics, basing their statements on insufficient evidence, have misinterpreted the Puritan's use of typology. One example, discussed fully in a later chapter, will suffice here to illustrate. In discussing typology in reference to Edwards' _Images or Shadows of Divine Things_, Miller comments:

> Congregations in frontier settlements could be . . . thrilled by learning that the congregation of Israel, exiled from Egypt into the wilderness in the form of an army with banners, was a type of the church, and that consequently they themselves were the antitype. . . .[29]

---

material emblem had separated him from happiness. . . ." So far as I know, no critic has pointed out that the ambiguity of Hawthorne's attitude toward Father Hooper--the slightly ironic detachment with which he views the character--may suggest that in his exaggeration of a Puritan doctrine (the recognition of the consequences of Original Sin) Father Hooper seems to welcome the opportunity to "luxuriate" in the isolation which results.

[29] Jonathan Edwards, _Images or Shadows of Divine_

Puritan congregations did in fact perceive the analogy of their experience with that of the Jews in the wilderness, as I have noted above; but no Puritan congregation or its minister would refer to their experiences as the antitype. For if Puritan typologists agree on any single principle it is that

> . . . *all this typical Dispensation is expired and abolished by the exhibition of Jesus Christ the Truth and Substance and Scope of all*. . . . The Papists and other superstitious Christians do not believe this . . . and therefore they seek to add an external Legal Pomp and Splendor, which is Carnal, to the Worship of the Gospel. . . .[30]

Edwards himself points out, in Image 118, that although the type was often repeated, the "antitype is continual and never comes to pass but once."[31] The point at issue here is not simply a minor one. Typology proper ceases, the Puritans insist, with the fulfillment of the Old Testament types in the antitypes of the New Testament. If Puritan theologians did not insist on such limitations, as they well knew, they were providing grounds for the Roman Catholic doctrine regarding the continuation of Christ's priestly function in the person of the Roman

---

Things, ed. Perry Miller (New Haven: 1948), p. 8.

[30] Samuel Mather, *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament* (London: 1673), pp. 539-540.

[31] *Images or Shadows*, p. 94.

priest, and, in effect, denying the central Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.

Finally, a study of the imagistic character of Puritan typology, its backgrounds in the New Testament, Patristic commentators, and humanistic traditions, will contribute to a better understanding of, and provide groundwork for, a more complete study of the Puritan aesthetic than exists at present. An investigation of the aesthetic principles of Puritan literature is outside the scope of this study, yet because typology is a central part of the literature, they are tangentially related. As this study will demonstrate, the breadth of material which lies in the background of the Puritan's use of typology, his knowledge of a wide range of sources, and his careful selection from them, indicate a much more conscious artistry than is often granted to the New England authors. And, in some instances, a knowledge of the "poetics" of typology will indicate a much broader use of imagery than is apparent without such knowledge. In Graven Images, a recent study of New England tombstone sculpture, Allan I. Ludwig concludes that a single stone, dated 1797 and presenting a simple image of Noah's ark, is "the only typological stone in New England."[32] Ludwig mistakenly maintains that "the Puritans were not concerned about the theory of types."[33] They were, of course, and a better understanding of Puritan typology would have enabled Ludwig to identify more completely a number of images which he sees as "simple decorations." On the same page as the stone illustrating Noah's ark, for example, Ludwig reproduces four primitively carved borders of late seventeenth century stones. The designs represent bunches of grapes, and Ludwig correctly identifies them as sacramental symbols, citing John 15: 5 ("I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit . . .") as one representative text. But what Ludwig does not note is that the bunch of grapes is one of the most common typological symbols. For Christ is not only the "fruit of the vine Sion," and hence the antitype of a series of Old Testament leaders, particularly those of the House of David, who prefigure Him; but the cluster of grapes itself is related to the "first-fetched grape-cluster" which the Hebrew spies brought back from their first mission into the Promised Land, and which, in turn, is related to that "other crossing of the Jordan which is each Christian man's entrance into the kingdom of heaven. . . ."[34] Further, as Rosemond Tuve demonstrates, clusters of grapes in graphic works of art of the eleventh and twelfth centuries ("glass, illumination, wood-carving, enamels, painting, book-illustration") are "closely connected with . . . Christ in the wine-press of the Cross, the saving drink of blood. . . ,[and] Christ as the Fruit or as the Vine."[35] Typologically considered, then, the carvings on these stones represent the Christian's ernest of salvation, for those who share in Christ's death also share in His resurrection; the grape clusters are indeed "sacramental" symbols, as Ludwig notes, but their history is far more complex than he is aware. As a matter of fact, many of the early stones which Ludwig reproduces display typological symbols (many of them cryptically presented),[36] suggesting that the "primitive" art of the stonecarvers is a more sophisticated aesthetic than is commonly supposed.

---

[32] Allan I. Ludwig, Graven Images: New England Stonecarving and its Symbols, 1650-1815 (Middletown, Connecticut: 1966), p. 186.

---

[33] Graven Images, p. 187.

---

[34] Rosemond Tuve, A Reading of George Herbert (Chicago: 1952), p. 116.

[35] Tuve, p. 112. Tuve also notes that "Augustine calls Christ a cluster of grapes, like that brought hanging from a staff 'crucified as it were', and makes the contrast between the sour juice of the Old Testament (Christ drank the vinegar) and the sweet wine of the New." That such imagery would have been known to New England Puritans I demonstrate below in Chapter III.

[36] A number of stones (Plates 49-53) present a bird-like figure, often so obscurely carved as to be almost unintelligible. Ludwig identifies these as both peacocks and cocks, noting that the "peacock was a widely used funereal symbol in early Christian times," and that the cock was a symbol "of man's fall from grace," referring to Peter's denial and the crowing of the cock to signify his rejection of Christ (p. 133). But the one symbol which

Such misconceptions concerning typology of New England Puritanism are not limited to a study of the graphic arts. A number of critics have assumed that typology is limited in intellectual depth, because they see it as only one aspect of a rather unsophisticated theory of history, and that it is devoid of literary value, because they assume that the rigid application of a theory of types inhibits artistic expression. They have, therefore, somewhat scornfully dismissed its use as naive, if not outright destructive. Peter Gay's attitude is revealed in the tone of his discussion of Edwards' History of the Work of Redemption:

---

unites both peacock and cock in a single symbol of resurrection, and which Ludwig does not identify, is the Phoenix. This mythical bird was "introduced into Christian symbolism as early as the first century . . . by St. Clement in his first Epistle to the Corinthians. In Early Christian art, the phoenix constantly appears on funeral stones. . . . The phoenix later became a symbol of the Resurrection of Christ, and commonly appears in connection with the Crucifixion" (George Ferguson, Signs and Symbols in Christian Art [New York: 1966], p. 23).

There is also a possible connection of the bird figures with the pelican, based on such texts as Psalm 102: 6: "I am like a pelican of the wilderness." This statement is commonly interpreted as an allusion to Christ; as Ferguson notes, the pelican is "sometimes shown nesting on the top of the Cross" (p. 23). According to legend, the pelican pierces its own breast to feed its offspring with its blood. Such a symbol of love, united with blood imagery, became easily assimilated into Christian symbolism as a prefiguration of Christ's love and sacrifice.

> There was an Adam and an Eve, and they sinned and awoke to their sense of guilt; there was a Cain and an Abel, a Noah and a Moses, and while they were symbols and types, they were symbols and types in the way all creaturely beings represent both themselves and God's intentions. In the modern sense . . . , almost none of Edwards' history is history--it is Calvinist doctrine exemplified in a distinct succession of transcendent moments.[37]

One cannot argue with Gay that Edwards' history is not history in the modern sense, and one can agree that it has certain limitations. But what Gay does not acknowledge, though he is certainly aware of the facts, is that such a view of history is not Edwards' exclusive property, that it is a view which provides the basic approach to history from the beginning of the Christian tradition, and that, so far as the qualifying adjective is concerned, Edwards is not the only author who is guilty of making history serve doctrine--Calvinistic, Roman Catholic, political, economic, or otherwise.

Feidelson, on the other hand, concerned not with history but with aesthetics, condemns the use of typology because, he asserts, its "rigidity" inhibited the development of a symbolist literary tradition. Types, he correctly notes, were "expressly distinguished from merely illustrative similes and metaphors." And he continues: "Yet precisely in this distinction appears the characteristic narrowness of Puritan thought."[38] One may not wish to argue that typology influenced in any significant way the literary aesthetic which Feidelson obviously finds preferable to that of Puritan literature; but one should point out that Feidelson's view is limited because of the predetermined values which he brings to the subject. The same "narrow distinction" which Feidelson condemns in Puritan typology is characteristic of allegory generally. Although Feidelson's view of Puritan aesthetics would have been somewhat modified had he taken into account the medieval and Renaissance allegorical traditions from which Puritan typology evolves, one suspects that his condemnation of typology is simply part of his broader rejection of allegory itself. For, as Northrop Frye points out, a "critic is often prejudiced against allegory without knowing the real reason, which is that . . . allegory prescribes the direction of his commentary, and so restricts its freedom."[39] More importantly, however, Feidelson's thesis about Puritan literature is limited, because, for whatever reason, he fails to discuss the single Puritan artist who cannot in any sense be described as an "abortive symbolist." Edward Taylor is nowhere mentioned in Feidelson's study. To say, as Feidelson does, that "'typical' thinking in literature was beyond the pale"[40] is superficial as it relates to Puritan literature generally, and simply wrong in relation to Taylor's poetry. As I demonstrate in Chapter IV (and as Rosemond Tuve has shown in relation to George Herbert's poetry[41]), the typological construct, with its simultaneous view of biblical persons and events, its nuances of meaning, and its ordering of experience through a unified view of history, contributes not only to the structure of the poem, but pervades the patterns of imagery and functions generally as the dominant symbol of the poem. "Typical" thinking is a central part of Taylor's poetry.

---

[37] A Loss of Mastery, p. 97. While I agree essentially with Gay's analysis of Edwards (see below, Chapter IV), his study is based on a rejection of Edwards from the standpoint of the modern historian; Gay does not adequately acknowledge the Medieval and Renaissance historical traditions in which Edwards works.

---

[38] Symbolism and American Literature, p. 88.

[39] Northrop Frye, "Ethical Criticism: Theory of Symbols," Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton: 1957), p. 90. For a discussion of Milton's typology, see Frye's essay, "The Typology of Paradise Regained," Modern Philology (May, 1956), LIII, 227-238. William G. Madsen extends the analysis of Milton's typology to Paradise Lost in "Earth

Puritan typology, related either to a modern view of history or literary aesthetics, may not be acceptable to contemporary critics; it is mistaken, however, to assume that Puritan typology is simplistic. Samuel Mather's

---

the Shadow of Heaven: Typological Symbolism in Paradise Lost," PMLA (December, 1960), LXXV, 519-56.

[40] Symbolism in American Literature, p. 89.

[41] A Reading of George Herbert, pp. 103ff.

discussion of Samson as a type of Christ illustrates the complexity of the traditions which lie in the background of New England typology, and demonstrates that Mather, and other Puritans as well, was very much aware of these traditions. In discussing one of the categories of types, "Personal Types," Mather identifies Samson as a precursor of Christ, indicating in the course of his analysis the complex Renaissance traditions surrounding the Samson figure:

> Samson, a Person, whose Story is famous in the Scripture, and some think, that the Fame of him went forth amongst the Heathen; and that their Fables of the Strength of Hercules . . . took their rise from the Story of Samson. The Grecians commonly turning all into Fables, Graecia Mendax; and being great pretenders to Antiquity, being as drunk with the Pride of that Pretence (though as false) as the Papists are at this Day; and therefore making their own Country, the scene, and Stage of every wonderful thing. . . .[42]

In referring to the "Grecians," Mather, following Calvin and Beza (whom he cites) is not alluding to pagan Greeks, but to a specific humanistic school of typologists which developed in the fourth and fifth centuries in Alexandria, and which as part of its stated aims, attempted to incorporate Greek myth and legend into Christian tradition, thereby assimilating the Hellenistic culture into the somewhat antithetical Hebraic traditions. Samson, as F. Michael Krouse points out, was "one of the figures by means of which the Judaeo-Christian tradition embraced and absorbed the heritage of Paganism."[43] Mather not only rejects the "Fables" of the "lying Greeks," but also condemns the excesses of Patristic commentators who, as his comments clearly indicate, have interpreted Pagan figures as types on the basis of their "own fansies and imaginations," and without any scriptural warrant.

---

[42] Mather, The Figures or Types, p. 103.

The parallels between Samson and Hercules have a long history in the interpretations of the Church Fathers; they were apparently noticed first by Diodorus Siculus in the second century. In the latter part of the third century, Eusebius of Caesarea discusses a number of commentators who had noted the similarities between the two figures; and in the following century, Philastrius asserts that the Greeks had based the legend of Hercules on the historical Hebrew Samson.[44] By the end of the seventeenth century, as Krouse summarizes, Patristic commentators present four levels of interpretation of Samson's strength and the fact that it resided in his hair:

> In the literal sense . . . the story means that the strength of any Nazarite lies in his faithfulness to his vows . . . ; in the allegorical sense, Samson herein was a figure of Christ, who is our head; in the tropological sense, the hair of

---

[43] F. Michael Krouse, Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition (Princeton: 1949), p. 44.

[44] Krouse, in Chap. III, "The Samson of the Patristic Period," pp. 31ff.

> Samson denotes the cogitations and intentions of Man . . . ; and, finally in the anagogical sense, the hair signified that Samson's strength was supernatural, a special gift of God . . . (pp. 71-72).

It is obvious that Mather, as well as other New England Puritans, was aware of the traditions of Patristic interpretations, and equally obvious that while his typology is different from the Church Fathers', it is not ignorant of it. Mather frequently cites Patristic commentators, primarily to condemn them, as in the case of Samson, for departing from the biblical context. Puritan typologists rigidly exclude reference to the Renaissance interpretations identifying Hercules and Samson; as Mather emphatically explains:

> Men must not _indulge their own Fancies_, as the Popish Writers use to do, with their Allegorical Senses, as they call them; except we have some Scripture ground for it. It is not safe to make any thing a Type meerly upon our own fansies and imaginations; it is _Gods_ Prerogative to make _Types_.[45]

The purpose of this study, then, is to investigate the traditions of the typology of New England Puritanism. Chapter I traces the origins and early development of typological exegesis from the New Testament authors and early Patristic commentators to Augustine; Chapter II analyzes the increasingly broad use of typology, particularly in the allegorical interpretations of the Church Fathers and in the use of the typical event in the Renaissance, especially as it is related to iconography and the arts. Chapter III presents an analysis of the relationship of the Reformers to the development of Puritan typology, and of the major seventeenth century typologists whose works were widely read in Old and New England. Finally, Chapter IV, "The Typology of Edward Taylor and Jonathan Edwards," identifies the Patristic and Protestant traditions from which the typology of Taylor and Edwards develops, suggesting that in Taylor's Meditations, typology receives its finest expression, and that in Edwards, typology provides only the initial framework for a broader world view. Beginning with the simple concept of the type-antitype construct as a "person in the Old Testament who prefigures Christ in the New," each chapter indicates how the biblical material viewed typologically expands throughout the centuries. In discussing the major Puritan typologists in Chapter III, I will indicate how the various traditions throughout this long period of development contribute to the Puritan's definition and practice of typology, indicating also in this chapter how the Puritans themselves define typology, particularly in relation to the practice of Patristic commentators and various seventeenth century writers whose use of typology differs from writers whose orientation is primarily theological. It remains here, however, to discuss several general aspects of Puritan typology and to identify the basic presuppositions of the typological approach.

---

[45] Mather, _The Figures or Types_, p. 55.

As this study will demonstrate, Puritan writers themselves have contributed to much of the misunderstanding in regard to typology, for they actually practice not one typology, but three, each one directly related to the other, but each one separate in aim and methodology. Further, these different typologies are related to the form in which the Puritan usually presented his typological analysis, the sermon. Samuel Mather's The Figures or Types of the Old Testament is a series of some sixty-eight sermons, preached from March 23, 1666, to February 28, 1668; each chapter is a sermon, or sometimes two combined in a single chapter, and organized according to the three-part sermon pattern. Given these practical limitations to the form a typological discourse could take, unlike the treatises of the Church Fathers, Puritan typology was molded by the practical demands of a sermon audience and by the necessity of fitting typological exegesis into the ordinary Sunday or weekday discourse. This is not to say that all Protestant studies of typology were originally sermons; William Guild's Moses Unveiled (London: 1620) is a simple devotional pamphlet, and K. Vitringa's Observations Sacra (Leyden: 1689-1708) is a full-scale theological treatise. But the studies most used by New England Puritans, Thomas Taylor's *Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows* (London: 1635), Samuel Mather's *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament* (London: 1673), and Benjamin Keach's *Tropologia* (London: 1681), were all patterned on the sermon form; as such, they reflect its three-part division: exegesis of text, analysis of text, and application of text.

The three aspects of the interpretations of the type-antitype in Puritan literature are historical typology, allegorical typology, and devotional typology.[46]

---

[46] These categories are similar to the first three levels of the scholastic fourfold sense of scriptural interpretation: literal, allegorical, tropological, anagogical. Puritan typologists would object, of course, to this comparison; and there are significant differences between the Puritans' typology and the allegorical interpretations of the Church Fathers. I discuss these general differences here in the Introduction, and point out, in Chapter III, the major ways in which the methods are dissimilar. But, generally speaking, the widely-known scholastic distich summarizes the major methods of interpretation:

> *Litera gesta docet; quid credas allegoria;*
> *Moralis quid agas; quo tendas anagogia.*

One could also argue that the fourth sense, the anagogical, is reflected in the increasing number of Puritan jeremiads in the latter part of the seventeenth century, as the second and third generation ministers bemoan the falling away of God's chosen people and warn them of dire consequences to come. (For a discussion of the jeremiad, see Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* [New Haven: 1953], II, 27ff.) In this sense, however, the anagogical interpretation would be more properly called "eschatological," providing a fourth kind of

The first level, historical or literal, is an analysis of scriptural parallels "within the historical framework of revelation."[47] Taking quite literally Christ's injunction to "search the scriptures," Puritan authors begin each identification of type and antitype by marshaling a small concordance of all scriptural passages in both testaments which relate to the historical nature of the type. This level of interpretation

> . . . presupposes scrupulous care and attention to the literal meaning of the text and to its literary and historical background. . . . This involves treating poetic imagery as imagery, metaphor as metaphor: "literal" interpretation is not "literalistic," but seeks to establish the original meaning of the text as intended by its author.[48]

Such a concern inevitably involves the authors of the New Testament books, for these writers were the first to establish the correspondences between Christ's acts and the Old Testament prefigurations.

> The New Testament narrators, often expressly, but often tacitly, parallel Old Testament events, and they presuppose of the reader that he will know of this . . . relationship of correspondence. . . .[49]

---

typology, eschatological typology. Such uses of the type-antitype, however, are quite unusual, and are so minor as not to be of any central importance.

[47] Woolcombe, Essays on Typology, p. 40.

[48] R. A. Markus, "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture," Church Quarterly Review (October-December, 1957), CLVIII, 445-446.

[49] Gerhard von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," p. 20.

The referral of New Testament writers to typical passages in the Old Testament goes far beyond the use of actual citations and the explicit identification of the type. Psalm 22, for example, which begins with the anguished cry of the psalmist, "My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me. . . ," is, for Puritan typologists, a "typical" psalm prefiguring the Passion of Christ. This sense of historical context and literal correspondences between the two testaments excludes figures and events in secular history; Puritan writers will admit of no type, unless, as Mather insists, there "is express Scripture for it."[50] For each Puritan analysis of the type begins with the assumption that it is only in the Bible that the Christian finds an historical record of God's acts in time. Literal typology is one method of viewing the unity of these acts: "Types suppose still the Verity of some History . . . ; when it is applied to Christ in the New Testament, it supposeth such a thing was once done. . . ."[51] Literal typology is primarily a method of exegesis; it is a means of discovering "God's Prerogative" in relation to types.

Beyond the analysis of the literal meaning of biblical texts within a historical context, however, is a second kind of typology which is practised by Puritan authors. One hesitates, because of the possible confusion, to call this aspect of Puritan interpretation "allegorical" typology, for the Puritans stringently criticize the allegorizing of the Church Fathers. Nevertheless, this is the term Puritan typologists employ; and, within the limitations which they impose upon such interpretation, it is the term which is the most precise in defining this aspect of New England typology. Yet, Puritan writers are extremely careful to distinguish between the kind of allegory which is a central part of the Roman Catholic exegetical traditions and the limited allegory which they practice in relation to the type-antitype construct. That Puritan writers themselves are not always so strict in following their own limitations as their theoretical statements imply, and that some typological studies seem to be similar to the Patristic interpretations which they condemn, is an indication of the difficulties in making the distinctions.[52] On the other hand, Puritan typologists recognize the necessity for allegorical interpretation of scripture, for they are aware that certain

---

[50] _The Figures or Types_, p. 53.

[51] Benjamin Keach, "The Epistle to the Reader," _Tropologia_ (London: 1682), II, A5.

---

[52] As far as typology is generally concerned, however, modern literary critics have encountered many of the same difficulties. Critics of literary theory, viewing typology in relation to literary form, consider the types as a rather minor subdivision of allegory. Northrop Frye implies by his definition that typology is a part of "naive allegory," a form of "discursive writing [belonging] chiefly to education literature . . . , schoolroom moralities, devotional exempla, local pageants, and the like" (Anatomy of Criticism, p. 90). To Edwin Honig, typology is an "allegorical trope" (Dark Conceit: The

---

Making of Allegory [Evanston, Illinois: 1959], pp. 11ff.); Angus Fletcher considers "paradeigma," "figura," and "schema" as synonymous with "typos," suggesting that the visual quality is the distinctive characteristic of these types of allegory (Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode [Ithaca, New York: 1964], pp. 179ff.). In treating types in conjunction with medieval allegory, Rosemond Tuve recognizes the relationship of typology to allegory generally but finds that during the Middle Ages the assimilation of the typological construct into literary traditions of allegory eliminates the typological as a separate and distinct category (Allegorical Imagery: Some Medieval Books and Their Posterity [Princeton: 1966], especially Chap. I, "Problems and Definitions," pp. 3-55).

Unlike most literary critics, however, biblical critics, Puritan and modern, are unanimous in viewing typology as a subdivision of analogy, and considering the typological construct as a category separate from allegory, acknowledging, however, that in the Patristic commentators the two forms have a tendency to merge. Although I discuss the distinction fully in Chap. III, the following two citations, one by a modern biblical critic, and the second by a Puritan, will indicate how consistently Protestant commentators have insisted on the distinction between typology and allegory. Woollcombe writes: ". . . There is a close resemblance between . . . allegorism and . . . typological exegesis. . . . But the similarities between allegorism, typology and the study of the fulfillment of prophecy are not so close as to justify ignoring the differences between them, and using one of the terms to do so. . . . The methods of handling the Old Testament which were already practised in Judaism were allegorism and the study of the fulfillment of prophecy. Historical [literal] typology . . . came into existence with Christendom. . . . It was . . . considerably influenced by allegorism. But when St. Paul wrote that Adam was a figure . . . of him that was to come, he was saying something substantially new"(Essays on Typology, p. 42).

Benjamin Keach is more precise in distinguishing, from the Puritan point of view, the major distinctions between typology and allegory: "1. Types suppose still the Verity of some History. . . . Allegories again have no such necessary Supposition, but . . . are propounded parts of the Scripture are themselves "allegorical," and that New Testament writers, particularly St. Paul and the author of Hebrews, adopted allegories as teaching devices. But Puritan typologists insist that such passages are few; and these, according to typologists, are not allegorical in a conventional sense, but "figurative" as opposed to "literal." Benjamin Keach, for example, treats types as a category separate from figurative scripture, insisting upon their literal and historical nature, noting that although "*Rhetoricians* make a difference between *Metaphors*, *Similes*, *Parables*, and *Allegories*, yet in Divinity there is none, but that *Allegories* are more large and continued . . ."(II, A6). Cautioning his readers against

---

for some mystical End. . . .

"2. Types look only to Matter of Fact, and compare one Fact with another. . . . But Allegories take in Words, Sentences, Doctrines, both of Faith and Manners. . . .

"3. Types compare Persons and Facts under the Old Testament with Persons and Facts under the New. . . . Allegories look especially to Matters in hand, and intend the explaining some hidden and mystical sence upon the Words. . . .

"4. Types are only Historical. . . . But Allegories . . . are principally Doctrinal, and in their Scope intend not to clear or compare Facts, but to hold forth and explain Doctrines. . . .

"5. Types in the Old Testament respect only some Things Persons, and Events. . . . But Allegories . . . take in every thing, that belongs either to Doctrine, or Instruction in Faith or Practice, for ordering of one's Life " (*Tropologia*, II, A5).

a too extravagant typological interpretation, Mather also makes the same point:

> . . . there is an Historical Verity in all those typical Histories of the Old Testament. They are not bare Allegories, or parabolical Poems, such as is the Song of Solomon . . . ; but they are a true Narration of Things really existent and acted in the World, and are literally and historically to be understood (p. 128).

The distinction which Mather and Keach make, and which is true of all of the Protestant typologists investigated in this study, is that

> . . . there is a great difference betwixt an Allegorick Exposition of Scripture, and an Exposition of Allegorick Scripture: The first is that which the Fathers and School men fail in, *i.e.* when they allegorize plain Scriptures and Histories, seeking to draw out some secret meaning, other than appears in the Words. . . .[53]

This is not to say, however, that Puritan writers do not recognize figurative language in scripture, in which they include biblical allegory. The Deliverance of the Hebrew people from Egypt, for example, can be "both an *History* of Temporal Redemption; and yet withal an *Allegory* of Spiritual Redemption also."[54] Puritan allegorical typology begins with an exegesis of the literal meaning of a text, but extends that exegesis to an allegorical interpretation, firmly anchored in the literalness and historicity of the passage in question. As Mather points out, it is not necessary

---

[53] *Tropologia*, II, A6.

[54] *The Figures or Types*, p. 128.

> to the Nature of an Allegory, that it be always Res ficta: God, who is the Author of all the Arts . . . hath set no such Rule in the Art of Rhetorick, and if any Rhetoricians have done it, it is a Mistake: For Abraham and Sarah, and Isaac, and Hagar and Ishmael, is a real History; yet the Apostle affirmeth, That it is an Allegory, Gal. 4.

On the other hand, Mather objects to Patristic commentators "turning of all such allegorical and typical Histories . . . into meer Romances and Fictions," for this is, according to Mather, "not unlike the Transubstantiation of the Sacramental Elements . . ." (p. 128). Quoting Luther, Mather notes that such interpretations are Spumam Scripturae, "they beat the Scriptures into Froth by allegorizing all things" (p. 130).

Allegorical typology is the recognition that certain scriptural passages containing clear references to the type-antitype are themselves allegorical and necessitate an allegorical reading. When Christ says, for example, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John 2: 19), he is speaking both typologically (the Tabernacle in the wilderness and the Temple both prefigure the Messiah, and, typically, the Church), and allegorically; as Keach notes, a literal reading of this passage would "obtrude some falsity on the Scripture . . . ; such Places are to be taken Allegorically . . ." (II, A7). Such passages, however, apart from the Canticles and the

Book of Revelation, are relatively few in number and are clearly non-literal in meaning; the allegorical typology reflected in these scriptures causes little difficulty in interpretation. Even when the type-antitype relationship is explicitly identified in a biblical passage, however, in most cases the identification involves only a single statement. To elucidate as fully as possible the implications of each passage and to identify the numerous parallels involved in the type and antitype relationship is the primary purpose of allegorical or interpretive typology. Keach finds thirteen significant parallels in Christ's comparison of himself with the Brazen Serpent which the Israelites "lifted up" in the wilderness;[55] the single statement in John's Epistle, "As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up" (3: 14), provides the basic frame of reference for Keach's allegorical interpretation. Yet the central difference between Keach's interpretation and the allegorical readings of Patristic commentators is the fact that, although the "tenor" of his allegory may seem somewhat ingenious, the "vehicle" is firmly anchored to the historical sense of the passage and respects the literal nature of the biblical text.[56]

---

[55] Tropologia, II, 285-86.

[56] By way of contrast, Philo's allegorizing of the

The third kind of typology which New England Puritans practice follows inevitably from the adaptation of typological studies to the form of the sermon. Literal typology is a method of exegesis; its primary concern is with grammar, etymology, and contextual parallels. Allegorical typology extends the implications of biblical texts to include the allegorical ramifications of the type-antitype identification. But no Puritan sermon ended without a more precise application of scriptural study to the specific needs of the congregation; as a result, "devotional" typology developed as a third kind of typological practice, particularly in New England. This use of typology was, of course, not new to Puritans. Most Patristic exegesis, as Markus points out, falls into this category, for it was intended primarily for homiletic purposes.[57] For Puritan authors, however, devotional typology is used primarily in two ways: first, as sermon illustrations, embedded within the discourse proper and

---

same passage, an interpretation which was adopted by Origen and numerous medieval commentators, views the serpent as a symbol of "self-mastery" (sothroson), basing this reading on the Greek term in the LXX. The serpent is made of brass "because this is as near to the golden virtue present in Moses as the people could come" (Erwin R. Goodenough, By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism [London: 1935], pp. 219-220).

[57] "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach," pp. 445ff.

incidental only to the main focus of the sermon. In the farewell sermon delivered to the first Puritan group which sailed from Southampton, for example, John Cotton makes a quite casual reference to the Temple as a type of Christ.[58] The major use, however, is in the application of the typological sermon to the spiritual needs of the congregation. Thomas Taylor, for example, ends each chapter of his study with the heading: "For applycation, briefly." He then lists, carefully numbered and summarized in the margin, the "uses" which can be drawn from the sermon discourse.[59] Devotional typology is essentially a teaching device; and, while found, in New England at any rate, primarily in the sermons, develops quite early, as I discuss below in Chapter II, in relation to the graphic arts, illuminated manuscripts, architectural decorative motifs, and so on. The woodcuts in the New England Primer, several of which are types, are examples of the broader scope and limited theological aims of devotional typology.

As I have suggested, the three different kinds of Puritan typology are related specifically to the sermon form and follow quite naturally from the Puritans' attempts to adapt a primarily scholarly activity to the needs of the congregation. Samuel Mather's sermon on the typological significance of Manna, preached to his Dublin congregation on April 16, 1668, illustrates in a specific way the three typologies of New England Puritanism. Mather is discussing in this sermon series the different "Occasional Types," those which were designed for one specific occasion and were not repeated, as contrasted to the "Perpetual Types," those which were repeated in each epoch of Hebrew history (such as the covenant relationship). Taking his text from I Corinthians 10: 11, "Now all these Things happened unto them for Ensamples: And they are written for our Admonition, upon whom the Ends of the World are come," Mather relates the account of the wilderness wandering and the miraculous appearance of Manna recorded in Exodus, Chapters 1, 15, and 16, to the New Testament context, pointing out that the "spiritual meat" referred to in the passage in Corinthians is a New Testament allusion to the Manna. Mather then cites the various New Testament scriptures which allude to Christ as the bread of life, relating these citations to the verses in I Corinthians and to the Exodus account. As in almost all examples of literal typology, Mather simply compiles a cross-referenced index of the passages either describing Manna itself, or those of New Testament authors referring to this aspect of the wilderness experience. Such methods require little interpretation, for Christ himself stated to his disciples that "Moses gave . . . not that Bread from Heaven, but my Father giveth you the true Bread" (John 6: 32); and Mather makes this explicit identification of the type-antitype relationship the key scripture in discussing the parallels between Christ and Manna. "The general Scope" of the passage in John, Mather asserts, is "*to hold forth* Christ *as the Food of our souls*."[60]

---

[58] For the text of this sermon, see "God's Promise to His Plantations," Old South Leaflets (Boston: 1895), III, pp. 12ff. There are, of course, references to types in all kinds of Puritan writing; it is in the sermons, however, that typology is consistently presented in these three aspects.

[59] Thomas Taylor, Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows (London: 1635).

Mather then discusses, in the second part of the sermon, the allegorical significance of the texts:

> But now to let you see a little more particularly the excellent Correspondence between the *Type* and *Antitype*, the clear and full *Analogy* that is between the *Shadow* and the *Truth* prefigured by it (p. 137).

Although the scriptural texts which he has discussed in the first part of the sermon are specific in the statement of the basic analogy, as in nearly all scriptural identifications of the type-antitype, the particulars of the analogy are only implied; it is these implied relationships which form the basis of the allegorical interpretation. Mather notes that "you may discern in it [the analogy between Christ and Manna] these five Particulars";

---

[60] *The Figures or Types*, pp. 137ff.

each particular provides a major subdivision, and each one contains two paragraphs, the first discussing the Old Testament account and the second indicating how Christ's life and work parallel the Old Testament incidents. The first parallel Mather identifies is that "Manna was a Portion prepared of God, and given down from Heaven to an unworthy murmuring rebellious People. . . ." In like manner, "so is Christ a Portion, and a Food prepared for every hungry Soul; and he came down from Heaven, and is sent and given of God, even to rebellious sinners . . ." (pp. 137-38). Secondly,

> Manna was outwardly and seemingly despicable and contemptible; yet indeed the choicest Food, and most excellent in all Respects . . . ; Christ, as to his outward Appearance is despicable and contemptible, and despised by the World . . . though in himself most precious and excellent.

Mather's third parallel is not as obvious as the first two, yet he convincingly assembles scriptural authority for his assertions:

> Something of a Mystery may be observed in the quantity they were to gather [which was to guarantee] to every one the same Proportion, [signifying] that spiritual Equality which is among Believers, all sorts of Believers having an equal Portion in Christ the true Manna. . . ."

The identification of the fourth parallel is somewhat more complex, for it is the "place" where Manna is gathered that leads Mather to introduce three subpoints indicating its significance: the Manna was gathered about "the Camp *of Israel* . . . and no where else to be found but there. So *Christ* . . . is to be had in the *Church*, but no where else. . . ." Further, the Manna was "*hidden in the Dew*, lapt up (as it were) in two Beds of Dew"; in like manner, "*Christ* is exhibited in the Word and Ordinances." Finally, the Israelites were instructed to go "*out of their Tents to gather it* . . .; so we must go forth out of our selves out of Sin, and self, and the Creature, to get Christ."

Mather then returns to the fifth major parallel, analyzing the significance of the "Time *when they had this Manna*." He notes that the Jews were to gather it early in the morning ("We should seek after Christ . . . in the *Morning* of our lives"), that they were to "feed upon it *daily*" (". . . we must receive him, and believe and feed upon him *every Day* . . ."), that they were to gather a "*double Portion upon the* sixth *Day*, and none upon the Sabbath . . ." ("The weekly *Sabbath now is a day of spiritual gathering, and getting Food for your souls*"), that the Manna ceased when the Hebrews entered the Promised Land ("So shall all Means and Ordinances, when we come to Heaven . . ."), and, finally, that there was a "*Golden Pot of it reserved and kept by them for ever*, being laid up before the Lord in the Holy of Holies [in the Temple]" (". . . Christ shall be laid up as it were in the Golden Memories of the Saints . . . for a Memorial before the

Lord . . ."). Mather's interpretation is more complex and less simplistic than this brief summary indicates; he relates the parallels he draws to express scriptural authority, demonstrating in a striking way, a thorough mastery of the biblical texts, especially the various connotations of the Hebrew and Greek terms under discussion. Although the parallels may seem somewhat over-ingenious, his allegorical reading of the type-antitype is expressly anchored to the biblical passages before him. Allegory may restrict a commentator's freedom (as Frye suggests); in Mather's case, however, the restrictions are self-imposed.

Mather then concludes his sermon with a "three-fold Improvement," applying the meaning of the texts and of the parallels he has drawn to the spiritual needs of his congregation. The first "use" is that Christians may see that the Jews "had the Gospel preached unto them . . .: For this spiritual Bread was Christ. . . ." He reemphasizes that the significance of the type-antitype construct is to "let you see what of Christ, and what of Gospel Grace and Truth was held forth under those legal Types and Shadows." He then notes, as the second Use, that these typical relationships should "render Jesus Christ precious, exceeding precious to us . . . for that he is every way suitable to our Necessities: . . . He is the Bread of Life . . . for Food and Nourishment." And, finally, Mather notes that in God's redemptive plan in Christ there are

> Comfort and Direction to poor, weak, hungry, thirsty, Souls; whither to go, and to whom to repair for help and supply. . . . Here is Spiritual Bread . . . : Therefore feed upon Christ by Faith, and this will fill thy Hunger . . . and stay and support thy weary Soul (p. 144).

As in the case of most typological sermons, the final section is quite brief, providing a broad statement of *sententia* which is only generally related to the sermon itself.

Finally, central to an understanding of Puritan typology is the recognition of the relationship of typology to the Christian theory of history, for the types testify to the overall design of God's acts in time and to the progressive character of divine revelation. It is true that the "providential" theory of history is, as Kenneth Murdock notes, a belief that God "directly manipulated human affairs, rewarding good men on earth and punishing bad, exerting his 'providence' to uphold the good and crush the evil."[61] It is also true, however, that the

---

[61] Kenneth B. Murdock, *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England* (New York: 1963), p. 74. For other discussions of the providential theory of history, see Murdock's essay, "William Hubbard and the Providential Interpretation of History," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* (Worcester, Massachusetts: 1943), LII, 15-37; R. L. P. Milburn, *Early Christian Interpretations of History* (London: 1954); Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress* (Berkeley: 1949), especially Chap. I, "The

Christian view of history is more complex than simply a concern with the manipulation of human affairs or the controlling of events. For one of the basic presuppositions of typology, and a more important aspect of the Puritans' view of history, is "to discover in the myriad details of history the grand divine design."[62] Types presuppose, Horace D. Hummel suggests, the "vertical unity of nature, history, and individual," as well as the "horizontal homology of past, present, and future, as all realms and times are concentrated" in God's eternal present.[63] Such unity is twofold: first, types "confirm that all events prior to the Incarnation are meaningful only insofar as they are seen to be preparatory to the advent of the Messiah,"[64] thereby testifying to the unity of the Scripture. Second, typology, in its relation to Christian history, presupposes a unified design which existed before the history of the

---

Apocalyptic Image of History," pp. 1-21; and A. C. Charity, Events and Their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante (Cambridge: 1966).

[62] Gay, A Loss of Mastery, p. 4. See also Douglas Bush, "History and Biography," English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century: 1600-1660 (Oxford: 1945), pp. 209ff.

[63] Horace D. Hummel, "The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation," Biblical Research (1964), IX, 49.

[64] C. A. Patrides, The Phoenix and the Ladder: The Rise and Decline of the Christian View of History (Berkeley: 1964), p. 8.

Hebrew people and its culmination in the Messiah, and which will continue to exist after human history is complete. When Perry Miller notes that "the fascination which typology exerted on great minds in many centuries . . . was its promise of delivering a unified meaning for history,"[65] he is correct as far as he goes. For typology delivers not only a unified meaning for history, but for time itself. Types, as one kind of providence, existed before time in the mind of God; further, each type and its antitypical counterpart also foreshadow the moment when "time should be no longer," when the Holy City would no longer be the temporal Jerusalem, but the eternal "city foursquare." As C. A. Patrides observes,

> If the meaningless cycles of flux and reflux common to the Greco-Roman attitude toward history are like the legendary phoenix, periodically dying only in order to revive again, to Christians, on the other hand, history is like Jacob's Ladder, leading the Christ-guided pilgrim forever upward in a straight line toward the Eternal City. . . .[66]

---

[65] Images or Shadows, p. 7.

[66] The Phoenix and the Ladder, p. 9. I have purposely avoided using in this study the term "archetype," in the Jungian or any other sense. I have no doubt that, in general, certain types can be correlated with archetypal patterns; but I am convinced that an understanding of the Puritan practice of typology within the context of seventeenth century intellectual history would not be furthered by the introduction of the Jungian concepts. New England Puritans do use the term "archetype" in conjunction with two closely related concepts, "ectype" and "entype" (see Perry Miller, The New England Mind, I, 164 ff.); but these terms relate to the concept of

Types, to continue the metaphor, are the rungs on the ladder.

"Technologia," based primarily upon Ramistic principles of logic, and are not used in relation to types. I should also note that in this study I do not use the term type, or any of its forms, except in the technical sense of "typological."

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF TYPOLOGY

In preparing for the posthumous publication of the second edition of his brother Samuel's *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament*, Nathaniel Mather prefaced the work with a short apology "To The Reader," explaining that the work would of necessity have some defects, for his brother was unable to prepare the work himself for the press. Nathaniel suggested, however, that the work would have, in spite of its roughness, significant religious value, for a study of typology "is a Subject which None, or almost none hath waded through before him."[1] Samuel's book is certainly one of the most extensive studies of biblical typology; but Nathaniel somewhat overvalues the originality of his brother's work, for, beginning with the Epistle of Barnabas in the first century A.D. and ranging to the voluminous 1000-page study of Patrick Fairbairn in 1847,[2] nearly every major biblical expositor "wades through" the subject. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the backgrounds and early development of typology, studying the relationship of typology to the Messianic and prophetic traditions of Judaism and to the allegorical interpretations of Philo Judaeus, analyzing the developing complexity of typology in relation to the evolution of principles of biblical interpretation, and illustrating the increasingly complex typological analyses by presenting a number of Patristic interpretations of the Exodus typology.

---

[1] Nathaniel Mather, "To The READER," in Samuel Mather, *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament* (London: 1705), p. 5. I cite from the second edition throughout this study; except for the preface "To The READER" and the addition of an index by Nathaniel, the two editions are identical.

[2] Patrick Fairbairn's *The Typology of Scripture, or The Doctrine of Types* (Edinburgh: 1845-47) is the last

Typology proper begins with the work of the authors of the New Testament books. As with much of Christian thought, however, certain Jewish and Greek traditions contribute to the framework of the typological approach; further, typology could not have developed as it did without a clear relationship to the traditions in which New Testament authors frame their message. Perhaps the most

---

major study of typology. The "shrillness" of Fairbairn's defense of the subject indicates that, even by mid-century, the inroads which German historical biblical criticism had made into the "non-scientific" approach to the Scriptures were becoming impossible to ignore. Even many recent typological studies begin on a somewhat apologetic note, reflecting the ambiguous status which typology has in modern biblical criticism. R. A. Markus notes, for example, that the study of typology "can still . . . meet with opposition" and that many "of those who accept it do so feeling ill at ease" ("Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture," Church Quarterly Review [October-December, 1957], CLVIII, 442).

central characteristic of typology in its early practice is its dependence upon the Hebrew Scriptures and its relation to the kerygmatic missions of the early Fathers. Until the fourth century, there was no clearly established New Testament canon; "scripture" meant the Old Testament, particularly the Greek version, the Septuagint. The development of any typology meant, then, that the identification of the type depended upon a knowledge of Hebrew Scripture and the Messianic traditions of prophecy. The antitype could not be located in a body of works which existed only fragmentarily before the Council of Nicea; it was therefore found primarily in the oral traditions of the early Christians and in that body of preached material called the "kerygma." Committed to converting first the Jewish nation, the early Christians referred to the Old Testament figures and events as precursors of the fullness of the law found in Christ; hence, the foundations of typology are actually in the prophetic utterances of the Old Testament.

Hermeneuticists are generally agreed that in "Old Testament prophecy itself typology is already playing a part";[3] they disagree, however, as to the exact nature of the relationship and to the extent which early Christian typologists were indebted to specific Rabbinic schools of interpretation. Two characteristics of Judaistic thought do seem to have played a central part in the formation of the typology of the New Testament authors and early Church Fathers. The first is the numerous commentaries of the non-literal method of the Rabbis described as midrash. The term means literally "to seek out," and is contrasted to a literal interpretation of the text known as pashut, from a root meaning "to spread out."[4] One of the subjects which early became a part of the midrash interpretations was the predictive character of Messianic prophecy. Related to the general concept of the advent of the Messiah in a future age, were also a number of secondary considerations, such as a new and eternal House of God, superior to Solomon's Temple (Ezekiel 40-42), Ezekiel's vision of a New Jerusalem (43: 7), Hosea's prediction of a new Exodus which would be the final deliverance of God's people (Hosea 2: 14-15), and, perhaps the most famous, Isaiah's prophecy of the "Suffering Servant," who would be "wounded because of our transgressions" (Isaiah 53: 5).[5] Puritan typologists are familiar with each of these concepts and a number of others as well; generally speaking, however, they focus upon the covenant aspect of Messianic prophecy, considered by the Rabbis as heralding a new Paradise, but in the Puritans' view, as establishing a framework for their New England experiment. Jeremiah, for example, is the "prophet of the covenant," and it is to such passages as the following that the Puritans return again and again:

---

[3] Walther Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed. Claus Westermann (Richmond, Virginia: 1963), p. 234.

---

[4] Harry Austryn Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers (Cambridge, Mass.: 1964), I, 24.

[5] Biblical critics term these interpretations "recapitulative prophecy." For an extended discussion of the

> Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:
>
> Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day _that_ I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD:
>
> But this _shall be_ the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people (31: 13-33).[6]

For New Testament authors, however, and for the early Christian preachers, the Rabbinic traditions provided a background for typological exegesis; ready at hand lay a Jewish method of interpretation which implied that an

---

Rabbinic interpretations of this kind see Jean Daniélou, _From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers_ (Westminster, Maryland: 1960), especially Chap. I, "Adam and Christ in Holy Scripture."

[6] For a full analysis of the relationship of prophecy to the history of the covenant, see R. E. Clements, _Prophecy and Covenant_, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 43 (London: 1965).

historical event found its fulfillment in the future, "a greater than David would come." To the early Christians, of course, he had come in the person of Christ.

Secondly, "impressive evidence for the suggestion that early Christian typology is in part derived from Jewish liturgical typology" has been assembled by R. P. C. Hanson.[7] By analyzing extant fragments of the Jewish liturgy, in such works as _The Damascus Document_, the _Zadokite Fragment_, and one of the earliest Rabbinic commentaries on the prophetic passages in Habakkuk, the _Habakkuk Commentary_, and particularly in the compilation of liturgical formulae in a Syriac work of the fourth century, the _Apostolic Constitutions_, Hanson has demonstrated that the long prayer of the anaphora was "little more than the rehearsal of a number of 'types' taken from the Old Testament" (p. 18). In the liturgy, the Rabbi apparently provided the anaphoric phrases, invoking God as He who

> manifested Moses as the giver of a written law,
> glorified Aaron and his descendants with the priesthood . . . ,
> chastised the Egyptians with ten plagues,
> brought the Israelites across the sea . . . ,
> produced water from a rock,
> [and] raised manna from heaven and quails for food from the air . . . (pp. 18-19).

---

[7] R. P. C. Hanson, _Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture_ (Richmond, Virginia: 1959), p. 17.

This prayer is of course a part of the Christian service; but it exists in much earlier Jewish liturgical services, and according to Hanson and other biblical scholars, had been, in part at least, incorporated quite early within the Christian service with very few changes.[8] Hanson concludes that there was

> already in existence before the birth of Christianity a list, or several lists, of types, references to the saving or miraculous events ordained by God and recorded in the Hebrew Scriptures, and that these types were used in the Jewish liturgy (p. 19).

The incidents listed in the liturgy are not "types" in the sense that the early Fathers (or the Puritans) use the term, for they are only "recapitulative," emphasizing God's continuing actions in history. To this characteristic, however, the New Testament authors and the Church Fathers add the concept of *consumatio*, arguing, for Jewish converts especially, that the recapitulative acts of God culminate in the person of Christ.[9] Such, for example, is the central thesis of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

---

[8] Daniélou (pp. 98ff.) interprets the prayer in the same manner, citing a study by D. Kaufmann, "Sens et origine des symboles tumulaires de L'Ancien Testament dans l'art chrétien primitif," *Revue des Études Juives*, correlating the list of types in the prayer with the earliest funerary symbols. All three critics agree that the absence of any obvious Christological reference in the list of God's acts testifies to a much earlier, Jewish origin of the liturgy.

In addition to the characteristics of typology found in the Jewish prophetic and liturgical materials, Jewish and Hellenistic traditions of allegory also contribute to the early development of typology, particularly the allegorical interpretations of the Church Fathers. Biblical critics are undecided as to the relative contributions of the Hellenistic and Jewish traditions. Frederic W. Farrar, for example, while recognizing certain allegorical tendencies in the Talmudic interpreters, maintains that the

> Homeric studies of Pagan philosophers suggested first to Jews and then, through them, to Christians, a method of Scriptural interpretation before unheard of which remained unshaken for more than fifteen hundred years.[10]

According to Farrar, the Stoic philosophers,

> finding many lines in Homer which seemed to them unworthy, undignified, morally reprehensible, and even positively blasphemous . . . , set themselves

---

[9] Irenaeus (late second century A. D.) is apparently the first of the Patristic commentators to emphasize the consummative aspect of typology: "The Son of God became Son of David and Son of Abraham; perfecting and summing up this in himself . . ." (Demonstratio 37, cited in K. J. Woollcombe, "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," Essays on Typology, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22 [Chatham, England: 1957], pp. 42-43).

[10] Frederic W. Farrar, History of Interpretation (New York: 1886), p. 135.

> to explain away all such passages as containing myths, and sacred enigmas, and adorable mysteries (p. 136).

In like manner, the "Jews were driven to allegory . . . because their books were the constant butt for Gentile ridicule. . . ." Borrowing from the Hellenistic traditions the "very same methods" of interpretation, the Alexandrian Jews, according to Farrar, "not only embraced the allegoric system, but . . . gave it an immense and wholly unwarrantable development" (p. 136). K. J. Woollcombe, whose distaste for allegorical hermeneutics is not quite so obvious as Farrar's, agrees essentially with Farrar's position, although he suggests that the problem is somewhat more complex. In addition to "negative allegorism," whose object is to defend the Homeric myths from charges of blasphemy and immorality, Woollcombe sees a second and more influential aspect of Greek allegorism. Although he acknowledges that the Alexandrian Jews were sensitive to Gentile ridicule, he maintains that early typologists were influenced primarily by "positive allegorism," the "object of which is to elucidate the undersenses of the myths. . . ."[11] And he concludes:

> The main object of Christian allegorism has always been to elucidate the secondary, hidden meaning of

---

[11] For Woollcombe's full presentation of these points, see pp. 50-60.

> the Old Testament, rather than to defend its primary and obvious meaning against charges of immorality (p. 52).

There is, finally, a third aspect of the relationship of Jewish and Hellenistic allegorism to the origins of typological interpretations. In studying the backgrounds of Origen's interpretation of scripture, T. P. C. Hanson focuses upon the Messianic allegorical interpretations of the Rabbinic commentators, particularly the typological aspects of prophecy and the tendency of these to "blend into allegory." Utilizing the Essene texts contained in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and relating these to Rabbinic interpretations of Palestinian Judaism, Hanson concludes that it is

> impossible any longer to doubt that there was a lively and full-blooded tradition of allegorizing in existence in . . . Palestinian Judaism . . . , and that Christian allegory owes its origin mainly to this tradition (p. 35).

Hanson suggests that the Palestinian tradition existed prior to the Alexandrian interpretations and that if either tradition influenced the other, it is more likely that Alexandrian allegorism owes a much greater debt to the Palestinian traditions than to the allegorizing of the Stoics.[12]

---

[12] There is, of course, a further possibility not covered by these three positions. Christian typology may not be influenced by Hellenistic allegorism, or Hellenistic allegorism modified by Alexandrian Judaism, or by

The exact nature of the influence of any of these traditions is not as important to this study as the fact that, regardless of which exegetical school provided the dominant influence, or even if all three were equally influential, in the period in which typology originated, a climate of opinion existed in which typological exegesis could develop and flourish. Further, whatever influence these traditions may have had on the Church Fathers, that influence came not primarily from the Stoic philosophy or Palestinian Judaism, or Alexandrian Judaism, but through the influence of one writer in whom the traditions met and by whom they were modified, Philo Judaeus (c. 20 B.C. - c. 40 A.D.). Typology in the canonical authors of the New Testament is quite limited in scope; Philo influenced none of the New Testament writers, except perhaps the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[13] But before the New

---

Palestinian traditions of allegory, but solely by Alexandrian Rabbinic interpretations which existed quite separate from and prior to any Hellenistic influence. This position, as a matter of fact, has been presented by Wolfson in Chap. II, "The Allegorical Method," pp. 24ff. Wolfson makes the point that Philo did not "create" an exegetical method, but that he comes at the end of a long line of rabbinic commentators, and that, although slightly influenced by Hellenism, his methods are primarily dependent upon the dominant Judaistic traditions. Studies of influence of this kind are, by their very nature, never definitive; Wolfson's position, however, seems the weakest of the different approaches.

[13] Sidney G. Sowers argues persuasively that the author of Hebrews was influenced generally by Alexandrian Judaism, and specifically by Philo's hermeneutic method.

Testament canon was established, and the rather limited typological exegesis of its authors became the predominant method of Patristic commentators, the early Church Fathers modeled many of their interpretations upon those of Philo. Philo was the leading Jewish commentator of the first century A. D. If his interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures could be adapted to Christian exegesis, the Church could convince the Jews that the Messiah had indeed come, and, in part, was inadvertently testified to by the interpretations of a contemporary Jewish scholar. Further, Philo's relation to Hellenistic thought made his readings of scripture attractive to Gentiles as well, if not in substance or detail, then in method. Philo's significance in the early development of typology, however, is best seen in relation to the limited use to which New

---

In addition, Sowers notes that much of the terminology of Hebrews, which is unique to that book in the New Testament, is also found in Philo. The statement, for example, that Abraham was searching for a city made by God (which I have discussed in the Introduction) does not occur in Genesis; in the New Testament, it is found only in Hebrews 11: 10. But Philo also calls the land promised to Abraham a "city": "What good thing had Abram already done, that he bids him estrange himself from fatherland and kindred there and dwell in whatever land God Himself may give him? And that is a city good and large and very prosperous . . ."(cited in Sowers, _The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews_, Basel Studies of Theology, No. 1 [Zurich: 1965], p. 72).

Testament authors put typology, for the succeeding history of typology is indebted to Philo's example rather than to the methods of New Testament authors.

Typology in the New Testament is comprised of the words attributed to Christ in the gospels, and the interpretations of His ministry by the writers of the various epistles. Christ's own references to His fulfillment of prophecy occur mostly in the book of Matthew, the gospel most clearly designed to appeal to Jewish readers. In Matthew 12: 40, for example, Christ says: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." In the same context, Christ refers to Solomon, saying "a greater than Solomon is here." In addition to the explicit analogies which Christ Himself draws, Matthew characterizes Christ as fulfilling certain promises of the Old Testament when he (Matthew) quotes from Hosea in reference to the infant Jesus' flight into Egypt and His return: ". . . that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son" (2: 15). Neither Mark nor Luke refers explicitly to Christ's fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies, and in John's gospel, only one mention is made of Christ's typological significance: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up . . ." (3: 14). Although the term typos is not used, by associating the person and work of Jesus with events and persons in the Old Testament, Matthew and John represent an intermediate stage between the prophetic utterances of the Old Testament and the more complex typological interpretations of St. Paul and the author of Hebrews.

In the writings of St. Paul, the language of typology is not fully developed, for he uses various terms to describe the typological event. In Galatians 4: 22-24, for example, he interprets the fact that Abraham had two wives as an allegoroumena of the two covenants; in I Corinthians 10: 11, he refers to certain events in the Old Testament as skia or shadows of the reality that came in Christ. In the same context, however, St. Paul first introduces the term which indicates an event which foreshadows another event--typos:

> I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea;
> And all were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea;
> And did all eat the same spiritual meat;
> And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.
> . . . Now all these things happened unto them for typoi; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come (10: 1-4, 11).

He also uses the same term in Romans 5: 14 with the same meaning: "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses . . . who is the typos of him that was to come." St. Paul's use of three different terms (allegoroumena, skia typos) as essentially synonymous indicates that typology is only one of a number of methods by which he establishes the relationship of the Old Testament to the New.

The New Testament writer who assigns the most importance to typological interpretation is the author of The Epistle to the Hebrews. In fact, the epistle is founded upon typology, for the writer's purpose is to demonstrate to a Jewish audience that the men and institutions of the Old Covenant have been excelled and abolished by the New. The terminology of Hebrews is not consistent, using skia (shadow), hypodeigma (pattern), parabole (parable), as well as typos to describe the historical event in the Old Testament, although, as the context makes clear, the various terms are approximately synonymous. It is in Hebrews 9: 11 that the term "antitype" is first used. After the writer has characterized Christ as superior to the typical Melchizedek, and as comparable in function to the high priest of the Temple, the writer points out that Christ is superior even to the high priest, for "Christ is not entered into the holy places made by hands, which are the antitypos of the true; but into heaven itself. . . ."[14]

Although the references to typology in the gospels and epistles indicate that the terminology for describing the typical event has not been completely established, the basic concepts of typology are clearly illustrated. Both Matthew and Paul, writing before there is any New Testament canon, view the Old Testament in the light of divine history. The Old Testament Scriptures, they believe, are not simply the sacred books of the Hebrew people, and, as such, to be read in reference to that faith alone; they are records of God's dealings with His people, and in these relationships, the advent of His divine Son is foreshadowed. To both Matthew and Paul, the method of typological analysis is a basic way of reading history; it is centrally rooted in history itself. The same is even more true of the author of Hebrews:

> From first to last it is maintained that God spoke to the fathers in the prophets. The message

---

[14] It should be noted that in this first use of antitypos the meaning is different from what it later became, for here the Tabernacle, instead of the Temple, is characterized as the antitype. For a discussion of the possible significance of this shift, see Sowers, "The Shadow of the Heavenly and Eschatological Cult," pp. 105ff. Further, it should be noted that there are other New Testament passages which either explicitly or implicitly contain typological identifications. These are relatively minor, however, and do not add in any significant way to the ones which are discussed here.

> through the Son takes up and crowns all that had gone before. In each respect the New is the consummation of the Old. In virtue of this truth the work of Christ and the hope of the Christian are both described in Jewish imagery. . . .[15]

The typology of New Testament writers, then, is, with the exception of the book of Hebrews, a relatively minor method used to establish the relationship of the Old Covenant with the New. The concern of the canonical authors is primarily Christological: it is the acts and person of Christ which provide the substance of their message. Typology is of importance only as it relates to the gospel, the "good news" of Christ's coming. Had the Church Fathers--and the Puritans--followed only the New Testament example, typological exegesis would never have become the major concern that it did. That it did become of major concern is the result primarily of the hermeneutic principles and allegorical interpretations of Philo of Alexandria.

The practice of allegorizing an authoritative text had begun at least three hundred years before Philo's time, for Jewish commentators of the _midrash_ school had interpreted selected texts allegorically. But what had originally been a method of explaining unclear passages, justifying anthropomorphic descriptions of God, and relieving scripture of the charges of immorality in a relatively few passages, Philo applied indiscriminately to all of scripture. Philo did not deny that scripture had a literal and historical meaning; occasionally his commentary on specific passages begins with an exposition of the literal meaning of the text, using a standard formula to indicate the movement to an allegorical reading: "This is the literal meaning. But as for the deeper meaning. . . ."[16] But occasional comments on the literal meaning of a text, as Wolfson points out, is not interpretation, for to Philo "interpretation must discard the literal sense of a term or expression and change it to mean something else" (p. 34). The literal level is not unrelated to the allegorical meaning, but, as Philo commonly phrases it, only as the body is related to the soul, or the shadow of truth to the reality. Philo restricts his allegorical interpretations to matters "philosophical" and "ethical," but "apart from these two characterizations of the allegorical method no other restrictions of its use are to be found in Philo."[17] As Sowers points out, "Philo does not . . . wait for the text to present obstacles to literal interpretation, or suggestions at a hidden meaning before he allegorizes it" (p. 26). Individuals in the Old Testament are taken as personifications of abstractions--Moses is intelligence, Aaron speech, Enoch repentance, Noah righteousness, Abraham is virtue acquired by learning, and so on. Philo's discussion of the allegorical significance of Solomon's Temple indicates his allegorical approach. The Temple Court, he notes, represents

---

[15] Brooke Foss Westcott, _The Epistle to the Hebrews_ (London: 1892), pp. lviii-lix.

---

[16] Sowers, "The Two-Level View of Scripture," pp. 28ff. Sowers discusses in some detail a number of the means Philo uses to move from a literal reading to a statement of the "deeper" significance of the text. In so doing, Sowers attempts to answer the criticism of such scholars as Farrar who insist that "instead of elucidating the literal sense he [Philo] transforms it into a philosophic symbol" (History of Interpretation, p. 139). Irwin R. Goodenough maintains that it is a misreading to expect Philo to be concerned with "literalism," for in Philo "Judaism . . . had been transformed into a Mystery. The object of this Judaism was salvation in the mystical sense" (By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism [New Haven: 1935], p. 7). See also Goodenough's later study, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (Oxford: 1962), especially Chap. VII: "The Mystic."

> . . . the objects of sense . . . , the Sanctuary, the objects of thought. . . . The five pillars of the porch indicate the senses which have relations both outwards and inwards. The fourfold fabric of the veil [indicates] the four elements, and . . . the seven lamps of the Candlestick . . . the planets with the Sun in the midst.[18]

In essence, Philo's allegorical approach discards the historical context of the Scripture, focusing upon the "under-senses" of the text. Philo notes, for example, that there was

> probably . . . an actual man called Samuel; but we conceive of the Samuel of the scripture, not as a living compound . . . , but as a mind which rejoices in the service and worship of God and that only.[19]

---

[17] Wolfson, p. 35. [18] Cited in Westcott, p. 239.

[19] Cited in Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Oxford: 1941), p. 3.

As Beryl Smalley comments: "The abstraction which Samuel signifies is more real . . . than the historical Samuel"; in Philo's approach to Scripture, "the distinction between reality and imagery is melted" (p. 3).

Although many of Philo's allegorical interpretations are incorporated in the allegorical typology of the Church Fathers, he is not a typologist. In his works, the word typos does not appear as a technical exegetical term, although he uses typos in the general sense of "image" or "example."[20] Even the limited "typology" of the Jewish traditions of Messianic prophecy has only a minor place in Philo's approach to the Old Testament Scriptures. Moreover, his approach to scripture is "essentially distinct from Christian typology, which always implies that the two events, promise and fulfillment, have taken place in time as real, historical facts."[21] Yet, Philo's "two-level" approach to scripture was adopted by the earliest Christian apologists; further, Philonic allegory, combined with Alexandrian exegetical principles, dominated Patristic interpretations for over one thousand years. Although there were several biblical scholars (Diodorus, Theodore,

---

[20] Sowers, "The Concept of Typological Exegesis," pp. 89-97.

[21] Johan Chydenius, "The Typological Problem in Dante: A Study in the History of Medieval Ideas," Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, No. 1 (Helsingfors: 1958), XXV, 23.

Chrysostom, and others) associated with the Antiochene school of interpretation who denounced the allegorical methods of Philo, and insisted on a literal reading of scripture,[22] by the end of the fifth century, allegorical typology was the dominant method of typological exegesis.

The first indication of the Philonian influence on Patristic expositors is found in two non-canonical books which circulated early in the second century A.D. and which mark the transition from the historical typology of the New Testament authors to the allegorical typology of the Church Fathers. The first one, The First Epistle of Clement of Rome, is of relatively minor importance, for Clement's use of typology is only incidental to the hortatory message. But the epistle is related to later developments, and to Philonic exegesis, in that it is Clement who first introduces a classical myth and applies it to a Christian incident--the Phoenix is viewed as a type of "the resurrection of those who have served him with holiness in the assurance of good faith. . . . Even by a bird he shows us the greatness of his promise."[23] In describing the visit of the Jewish scouts to Jericho and Rahab's hospitality, Clement notes that the spies gave Rahab instructions to "hang a piece of scarlet from her house, thus showing that all who believed and set their hope on God should have redemption through the blood of the Lord" (p. 25). Such incidents are minor, but they clearly anticipate the subsequent development of Philonian inspired exegesis.

---

[22] For a discussion of the significance of the School of Antioch, see below, pp. 112ff.

[23] "The First Epistle of Clement," The Apostolic Fathers, trans. Edgar J. Goodspeed (New York: 1950), p. 62.

In The Epistle of Barnabas, however, allegorical typology has its beginning proper, for the author unites Philo's exegetical methods with the historical typology of New Testament authors. The major portion of the epistle is based on an extensive identification of Old Testament events and persons with those of the New. Thus the offering of Isaac is a type of Christ's death on the cross; the scapegoat is a type of Christ's suffering for the sins of man; the sacrifice of the red heifer is a type of Christ's death; Joshua was given his name, the Greek form of Jesus, because he was a type of the Messiah who was to come. The author of Barnabas also interprets the lifting up of the brazen serpent as a type of Christ's death, basing his reading on the scriptural type presented in John's gospel. In all cases, the writer uses typos to designate the Old Testament person or event which foreshadows its counterpart in the New Testament. The terminology is consistent, indicating that the rhetoric of typology was becoming settled. It is also in The Epistle of Barnabas that an allegorical reading is superimposed upon a type-antitype construct, suggesting that the writer was strongly influenced by Philo, or by the same impulses which contributed to Philonic allegory.[24] After identifying the Jewish rite of circumcision as a type of baptism, the author of Barnabas presents the following allegorical reading of the "spiritual significance" of the type:

> "And of his household Abraham circumcised eighteen and three hundred men." What, then was the knowledge given him? Notice that he mentions the eighteen first, and after a space the three hundred. The eighteen is I, [the Greek symbol for] ten, and H, [the Greek symbol for] eight; you have [the abbreviation for] Jesus! And because the cross was going to express God's favor in the T, he says also "three hundred." So he discloses Jesus by the two letters and the cross by the other. He who has planted this gift of teaching in us knows this. No one has ever learned from me a sounder lesson, but I know you are worthy of it.[25]

---

[24] Hanson argues that Barnabas shows "no signs at all of being influenced by Alexandrian, far less by Philonic, allegory. . . ." He feels that the Epistle seems "to be for the most part inheriting, and perhaps a little developing, the central Christian tradition of allegory" which was primarily influenced by "Jewish Palestinian allegory" (p. 103). Hanson's primary thesis in his book is that Christian typology develops from native Palestinian traditions, and not, except in very minor ways, from the Alexandrian traditions. Whether the author of Barnabas was influenced directly by Philo (as Farrar and others maintain) or by the climate of opinion which fostered allegory, is not as important as the fact that the same exegetical principles found in Philo are also in Barnabas.

[25] Goodspeed, Apostolic Fathers, p. 33.

Such a reading was adopted by Tertullian (third century), Ambrose (fourth century), Augustine (fifth century), Gregory (sixth century), the Venerable Bede (eighth century), and found its way into the Latin Fathers of the Middle Ages, appearing ultimately in Thomas Aquinas.[26]

Philo's ultimate significance to the development of typological exegesis lies not so much in his individual interpretations of Old Testament Scripture, although many of these interpretations entered the mainstream of Patristic commentaries and remained intact until the time of the Puritans, but in his codification, from whatever source, of a two-fold sense of scriptural interpretation. The literal and allegorical levels were, with little modification, adapted to the literal and typological levels of the New Testament authors. The literal and historical context was clearly only one aspect of scripture; for the Jewish Scriptures also testified, in a typological sense, to a prophetic future, which, by its very nature, required an additional method of interpretation. Philo's hermeneutical methods, because they so closely paralleled the developing exegetical theories of Patristic commentators, were incorporated quite early in Christian apologetics. Philo's two-fold sense of scripture, as it became incorporated in Patristic exegesis, contributed to the development of Christian hermeneutics. It was inevitable, however, that Patristic commentators would evolve a more complex approach to scriptural interpretation, for Philo's literal and allegorical readings combined with the literal and typological levels of New Testament authors actually implied at least three levels of analysis: literal, typological, and allegorical. Moreover, because typology, at least in the New Testament, was only a minor aspect of the approach of the canonical authors, it was also inevitable that the limited historical typology of the New Testament would become absorbed in much broader allegorical interpretations. Because of the interpretative freedom allegory allowed, and the relatively restricted approach of New Testament typology, in the developing Patristic exegetical traditions typology itself was allotted an increasingly minor role. By the fifth century, typology, at least in the form it was practiced in the New Testament, was viewed mainly as a subcategory of the allegorical level of interpretation. In many cases, the type-antitype construct provided only the initial analogical framework; the major portion of the interpretation was devoted to an allegorical reading.

---

[26] Farrar, p. 168.

Such changes, however, did not occur in isolation, for they were closely related to the developing hermeneutic principles of the early Church Fathers. Adopting

Philo's two-level interpretative principles, such early Patristic commentators as Clement of Rome, Tertullian, Iraneous, and Eusebius of Caesarea were content with a reading of scripture which presented a "literal" and "spiritual" level of meaning. More often than not, typology, insisting as it does on the unity of the testaments, was a central part of such exegesis. The literal level focused primarily on the Old Testament narratives; the spiritual level presented the typological significance of the Messiah. But in the work of such men as Justin Martyr, Origen, and the two great Church leaders of the fifth century, Jerome and Augustine, the two-fold sense of scriptural interpretation slowly evolved into a four-fold level of exegesis, which, with relatively few exceptions, became established as the orthodox method of scriptural interpretation and provided the basic approach to scripture throughout the Middle Ages.

One of the key figures in the early development of the four-fold method of interpretation is Justin Martyr (d. 164 A.D.). Justin's defense of the significance of the Old Testament in Christian doctrine is in the same tradition as The Epistle to the Hebrews. In addition, Justin's apologetic is also designed to answer the increasingly widespread attacks of the Gnostics, who "generally rejected, either entirely, as in the case of the

Marcionites and the Manichaeans, or at least in great part," the Old Testament.[27] Unlike the author of Hebrews, however, Justin is "ready to regard any passage in the Old Testament as spoken in the person of Jesus . . . , or persecuted Christians, or the Holy Spirit, or God the Father."[28] Particularly in his most famous study, Dialogue with Trypho, a polemic work designed to convince an Alexandrian Jew that Christ is the fulfillment of the Law, Justin is more unrestrained than New Testament authors in reading into Old Testament passages references to Christ and the Christian faith. In the main, however, Justin's typological identifications are less fanciful than those of The Epistle of Barnabas, and his type-antitype identifications are restrained by the biblical context in which they occur. The statement by the psalmist, "Lift up your gates, ye rulers; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may enter" (Psalms 24: 7), Justin identifies as a typical prophecy which has "reference to . . . Christ alone"[29] and to His breaking through the "gates of hell." Apart from his extensive catalogue of Old Testament types, however, Justin is significant to the development of the four-fold method of interpretation, as Hanson points out, for Justin introduces in conjunction with the literal and typological levels "several instances of full-blooded, well-developed allegory" (p. 107). In Chapter LXXXVI of the Dialogue with Trypho, for example, he collects indiscriminately all of the references to "wood" in the Old Testament and allegorizes these as references to the cross:

---

[27] Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church (New York: 1910), II, 453-54. For a discussion of Justin's Apologetics and their relationship to Gnosticism, see Johannes Quasten, Patrology: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature (Utrecht-Antwerp: 1962), I, 198ff. Daniélou points out that the most important problem the early Fathers had to face was the "question of the significance of the Old Testament." In essence, his comments summarize the major concerns of the Dialogue with Trypho: "Christians found themselves at issue with the Jews on the one hand, who still held to the literal meaning and kept the Law of Moses, and the gnostics on the other, who rejected the Old Testament . . ." (Jean Daniélou, Origen, trans. Walter Mitchell [New York: 1955], p. 140).

[28] Hanson, p. 105.

> . . . the righteous is said to flourish like the palm-tree. God appeared from a tree to Abraham, as it is written, near the oak in Mamre. The people found seventy willows . . . after crossing the Jordan. David affirms that God comforted him with a rod and staff. Elisha, by casting a stick into the river Jordan, recovered the iron part of the axe with which the sons of the prophets had gone to cut down trees to build the house in which they wished to read and study the law and commandments of God. . . . [Thus] our Christ, by being crucified on the tree . . . has redeemed us . . . (p. 242).

Justin does not ignore the literal significance and historical context of scripture nor does he belittle the literal meaning in favor of a "spiritual" rendering. It is true that he occasionally introduces allegorical readings as extensions of his typological interpretations, and, in so doing, tentatively establishes a three-fold level of interpretation. But such passages are only occasional; and in them, the typological exegesis, though somewhat less restricted than that of the New Testament authors, is not subordinated to the incidental allegorical renderings. Justin's allegory is simply part of his "exegetical subjectivism"; it is in no way indebted to the Philonian traditions of allegorizing. Approximately 100 years later, however, the three-fold schema is "systematized for the first time . . . [and a] definite terminology is adopted" by Origen of Alexandria.[30] As Hanson notes, "the fact that Origen divided the interpretation of Scripture into three senses is almost as well known as the fact that Caesar divided Gaul into three parts" (p. 235).

---

[29] Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho," The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1956), I, 241.

In a very real sense, Origen is the first of the Patristic commentators to apply "modern" textual principles to biblical exegesis. Among his more than 6,000 exegetical works is the first polyglot bible, the Hexapla (the "sixfold" Bible). By collating and publishing in parallel columns the six different available Hebrew and Greek versions of the Old Testament, he attempted to establish an authoritative text of the Septuagint; nearly two hundred years later, St. Jerome availed himself of Origen's work, and his influence extended, by means of the Vulgate Bible, throughout the medieval period. Although later authorities condemned him as an heretic for his Platonic doctrine of the "pre-existence of the soul," the major statement of his hermeneutic principles in De Principiis represents "the first attempt at a complete system of dogmatics," and is cited by St. Augustine more than any other work of the early Fathers.[31] Further, Contra Celsum, his major polemic treatise in answer to Jewish attacks on the Christian faith, remained an influential study throughout the Middle Ages, was important enough to English Puritans for major portions to be reissued in London, titled A Letter of Resolution Concerning Origen and the Chief of his Opinions (1661), and was one of the relatively few titles in the library of Edward Taylor.[32] Moreover, his codification of hermeneutic principles which resulted in the three-fold level of interpretation came at a time in the growth of the early church when some kind of systemization of interpretative principles was essential to the development and acceptance of an authoritative New Testament canon.

---

[30] Chydenius, p. 26.

---

[31] Schaff, II, 795.

[32] Donald E. Stanford, "Introduction," The Poems of Edward Taylor (New Haven: 1960), p. lvi. Taylor also translated De Principiis, although as I demonstrate in Chap. IV, Contra Celsum is more influential in relation to Taylor's poetry; the Christology of De Principiis, however, is reflected in the Christographia.

On the other hand, as far as the evolution of typological interpretation is concerned, Origen, more than any other Patristic commentator, incorporated Philonian allegory into his three-fold schema, thereby subordinating the historical typology of New Testament authors and even the relatively extravagant type-antitype identifications of writers such as Justin Martyr to the Philonian approach. As Johannes Quasten notes, as a "result of the Philonian impact on his thought," Origen is the "point of departure for all the exaggerations of medieval allegorism."[33] As in the case of Philo, Origen does not deny that there is a literal sense of scripture; like Philo, however, Origen rarely comments upon the literal level. He asserts that there are three "graduated" (teleois) levels; of these the literal level is the least important. In connection with his extensive production of Homilies, a type of popular exposition of scripture, Origen develops a second, higher level of interpretation which he calls "moral" exegesis. And finally, for those who have been endowed by God with a special gift of grace, there is a "spiritual" or "mystical" level. Generally speaking, Origen supports his three-fold schema with citations from the canonical authors of the New Testament, particularly St. Paul. In II Corinthians, 3: 6, for example, Paul writes that "the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life"; in Ephesians 5: 31, he speaks of Christ's relation to the church as a bridegroom's relation to his bride, and declares that this is "a great mystery." Through such passages as these, and numerous others as well, Origen establishes his schema. In addition, he frequently cites Proverbs 22: 20, where the mistranslated verse in the Septuagint, "Have I not written unto thee a triple way?", implies a three-fold scriptural signification.[34] In addition to adducing scripture to validate his textual approach, Origen, directly influenced by Philo's tripartite division of man into body, soul, and spirit (which Philo acquired from the Neo-Platonism of the Alexandrian school of interpreters), accepts the Philonian-Platonic concept of the faculties as testimony from the Hellenistic traditions to the legitimacy of a multilevel reading of scripture.[35]

---

[33] Johannes Quasten, "Origen: His Theology," Patrology: The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus (Westminster, Maryland: 1962), II, 93. See also Woollcombe, pp. 50ff.; Farrar, pp. 187ff.; and Schaff, pp. 785ff. Hanson, as I have noted before (see above, n. 24), in his attempts to establish Palestinian allegory as more influential than Philonian, discounts any major Philonian influence on Origen (see pp. 235ff.). Daniélou, however, extensively demonstrates that Origen was influenced by Philo in five major ways: "The first principle Origen took from Philo was that . . . Scripture . . . can never mean anything that would be unworthy of God or useless to man [;] . . . that everything in Scripture has a figurative meaning [;] that Origen . . . treats symbolism [by the Philonian methods; that] Origen took from Philo the idea of looking to Scripture for allegories applying to the moral life [; and that] Origen took from Philo . . . the theory that there are three meanings in Scripture, corresponding to the three parts of the soul and the three degrees of perfection" (Origen [New York: 1955], pp. 179, 181, 184, 186, 188).

---

[34] Hanson, p. 236. Ironically, however, the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew wrongly renders the original, which, correctly translated, reads "Have I not written unto thee excellent things."

It would be incorrect to say that Origen completely abandons traditional Christian typology in developing the moral and spiritual levels of interpretation; remnants of the kind of typology practiced by St. Paul and Justin Martyr are retained in numerous exegetical passages. But in his _Commentary on John_, and in other passages as well, Origen asserts that with the coming of Christ, types had been done away with; though they still might foster the faith of the beginning Christian, they had in fact lost their significance to the mature believer.[36] As Hanson notes, given this assumption, it is quite simple for Origen to ignore the "fairly broad and recognizable path of traditional Christian typology . . . [and] indulge in an allegory of a basically Philonic, Hellenistic" character (p. 253). Origen's three-fold level of interpretation and his subordination of the typology of the New Testament to his bent for allegory can best be illustrated by one of the earliest baptismal type-antitype identifications. In I Peter 3: 20-21, Noah's sojourn in the ark is identified as a type of Christian baptism:

---

[35] Farrar discusses in some detail the relationship of this aspect of Origen's thought to the Platonic sources of Philo's allegorism (see pp. 196ff.). Origen's own statement of the tripartite division of man occurs in the _Homily on Leviticus_: "The words of Scripture should be printed in the soul in one of three ways. The uneducated should be edified by the letter itself, by what we call the obvious meaning. People at a higher level should find edification for their souls. The perfect should be edified by the spiritual Law, as it contains the shadow of the blessings to come. Man is composed of body, soul and spirit, and the structure of Scripture has been planned by God for man's salvation in the same way" (cited in Daniélou, _Origen_, p. 188).

> . . . God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein [a] few . . . were saved by water. . . . The like *typos* whereunto even baptism doth also now save us. . . .

Although this passage, which also describes Christ's descent into Hell, has caused exegetes considerable difficulties in interpretation, the typological aspects are relatively simple. Noah was miraculously saved from death by water; the mystery of this salvation and the image of water are repeated in the sacrament of baptism. St. Peter's identification of the type-antitype involves, even within the difficult context, only these two parallels. In the Second Homily on Genesis, however, Origen's analysis is far more extensive.

---

[36] As a matter of fact, this is similar to the position which Roger Williams takes in his controversy with John Cotton over the legalistic aspects of the Massachusetts Bay theocracy. For a full discussion of this controversy, see Sacvan Bercovitch, "Typology in New England: The Williams-Cotton Controversy Reassessed," *American Quarterly* (Summer, 1967), XIX, 165-191.

Because the gnostics, particularly the disciples of Marcion, had questioned the credibility of the Noah account, Origen is forced to defend the historicity of the text more fully than he ordinarily does.[37] The story of the ark is, according to Origen, literally true; there was a real ark which did once float on the waters. But he immediately adds that the "truer" meaning of the account lies in its spiritual import: ". . . we call upon him who alone can lift the veil in our reading of the Old Testament, [and] we will try to see what this building of the ark contains for our spiritual profit."[38] Allegorically speaking, Origen notes, the Flood "is an image of the true and final end of this world"; as Noah was instructed to bring into the ark various animals, so the true Noah, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, is told by his Father . . . to construct an ark [the church] of measurement full of heavenly sacramentis" (pp. 105-106), and to people it with "those who are saved through the Church." Because the animals were divided among the various compartments, thus signifying various degrees of perfection, "this shows that in the Church also, though all share the same faith and are washed by the same baptism, all do not equally advance and each one remains in his own class" (p. 107). Origen discusses the symbolism of Noah's name (from the Greek cognates meaning "rest" and "righteousness"), and demonstrates how, at the end of time, all shall find rest and righteousness in Christ. In interpreting the rather lengthy description of the precise measurements of the ark, influenced perhaps by the mystical numerical interpretations of the Jewish Kabbalistic sects, and certainly by the Epistle of Clement, Origen moves considerably beyond the relatively simple moral lessons which dominate the first part of his analysis. One example will suffice to indicate the tenor of this rather lengthy passage. The length of the ark was 300 cubits, uniting, according to Origen, the mystical numbers of 100 and of three. The number 100 indicates fullness and

---

[37] Because I have been unable to obtain a text of the Second Homily, I am largely indebted to Daniélou, who cites fully from the work, in my discussion of Origen's interpretation (see From Shadows to Reality, pp. 104ff.). For an analysis of the extent of the Noah account in the Renaissance, see Don Cameron Allen, The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, and Letters (Urbana, Illinois: 1949), especially pp. 69ff.; and Arnold Williams, The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527-1633 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: 1948).

[38] This quotation, and the ones from the Second Homily which follow, are cited in Daniélou, and page numbers refer to his text (p. 105).

> contains the mystery of the totality of the Spiritual creation, as we read in the Gospel, when it is said that a man have a hundred sheep and

> losing one of them left the ninety-nine others and went to seek the lost one. . . . [However] this "hundredth," the fullness of Spiritual creation, does not subsist of itself, but proceeds from the Trinity and receives from the Father, through the Son and Holy Spirit, the length of life, that is the grace of immortality; it is because of this multiplied by three, so that having fallen from the "hundred" through ignorance, it is restored in the three hundred by the knowledge of the Trinity (p. 109).

Origen further interprets the remaining dimensions of the ark and labels his analysis a penetration of the "mystical" sense, the third level of his *schema*. He then digresses to add further comments to the second aspect of his interpretation, the moral sense. "The ark," according to Origen, "is the faithful soul. It should be coated with bitumen within and without, that is, perfect in knowledge and works." The "clean" animals are "memory, culture, understanding, reflexion and judgement upon what we read"; the "unclean" animals are "desire and anger" (p. 110). Further, the clean animals also signify the seven powers of the soul (the five senses, speech, and the generative faculty); the unclean animals are the ill uses that man can make of the powers of the soul.

Daniélou is only partially correct when he asserts that "this is an extension of typology to realms where there is no proper foundation for it";[39] for this is not typology, but subjective interpretation which, in one sense, extends beyond allegory to mysticism. St. Hilary, who was influenced in many ways by Origen's exegetical methods, expressly condemns this kind of reading in Origen: "The best reader is he who looks for the meaning of the words in themselves . . . and who does not insist that the words signify what he presupposed before reading them."[40] The Puritan point of view is succinctly expressed by Samuel Mather: "It is not safe for Men to form Allegories out of their own Fancies . . ." (p. 129). The major stages in the evolution of typological exegesis culminate in Origen's use of the typical event and the framework for future expositors is established; with a relatively few, minor changes, the "typology" of Origen is the typology of the Latin fathers from Augustine to Aquinas. As Smalley notes, "to write a history of Origenist influence on the west would be tantamount to writing a history of western exegesis."[41] The distinctions between typology and allegory were, with relatively few exceptions, clearly retained by the early Church Fathers, as they were by the authors of the New Testament. In Origen's system, however, the distinctions disappear; and historical typology, as a separate and unique method of biblical exegesis ceases to exist. Types continue to appear, of course, in the works of succeeding commentators, particularly in relation to the literal sense. In general, however, the typological reading is allotted only a minor role in such exegesis; further, when related to the "higher" senses of scripture, it is always subordinated to the central interpretation or so completely absorbed in allegorical or mystical or anagogical readings that it, in fact, ceases to be typology.

---

[39] *From Shadows to Reality*, p. 111.

---

[40] The Trinity, trans. S. McKenna (New York: 1954), p. 18. St. Hilory does not apply this criticism specifically to the passages discussed here, however, but to Origen's methods in general. For a specific Puritan contrast to Origen's interpretation, see Samuel Mather, pp. 74ff.

[41] It should be noted, however, that during the fourth and fifth centuries, in contrast to the Alexandrian interpreters, a group of scholars associated with Antioch attempted to combat the allegorical tendencies of Origen. Founded by Lucian and Diodorus of Tarsus, the Antiochenes (the major figures of the school during the fourth and fifth centuries were Theodore of Mopsuestia and St. Chrysostom respectively) "set out to correct the

In his interpretation of the Flood, Origen touches on one aspect ("an image of the . . . final end of this world") which, although not developed, anticipates the fourth level of interpretation which will be partially systematized 150 years later by St. Jerome and St. Augustine and codified in the fifth century by John Cassian: literal, allegorical, moral, and, finally, anagogical.

---

abuse of the allegorical method" (Smalley, p. 14). Their efforts were not successful, for Theodore's works were condemned for Christological heresies. Unlike Theodore, whose writings were primarily exegetical, St. Chrysostom was noted as a preacher and his influence on exegesis was slight. (See below, pp. 112ff.)

As Smalley notes, St. Jerome was "too hurried to be consistent or systematic" (p. 21); generally, he adopted Origen's three-fold division, citing the same texts which Origen adduces as support of the three-fold approach. Yet Jerome makes two significant changes in Origen's system, although he is not systematic in his procedures. Reacting to the attacks on allegorical interpretation by the School of Antioch, particularly by John Chrysostom, Jerome occasionally introduces the term tropologiam as a substitute for allegoriam. In the commentary on Ezekial, for example, the three parts of the three-fold division are described by the terms literal (juxta litteram), tropological (per tropologiam), and mystical (mysticus).[42] Tropologia had been previously used by Justin and Origen about allegorical and typical interpretation in general; with Jerome, it assumes the exclusive meaning of moral signification. A somewhat different classification, however, occurs in the Second Commentary on Amos:

> We must interpret the sacred Scriptures first, according to the letter (secundum litteram), by doing all that is prescribed in the way of moral conduct; second, according to allegory (juxta allegoriam), that is, the spiritual sense (intelligentia spiritualis); third, according to the bliss of things to come.[43]

---

[42] Wolfson, I, 65.

[43] Cited in Wolfson, I, 66. As Wolfson also notes, occasionally Jerome seems to imply only a two-fold classification: "Thus in one place he [Jerome] speaks only of

In this passage, Jerome appears to combine the literal and moral levels, thereby implying that in literal obedience to the Scriptures, moral conduct results. Further, the eschatological implications of the "bliss of things to come" anticipates, as does Origen's interpretation of the Flood as an image of the end of the world, the anagogical level of interpretation.[44] Jerome's hermeneutic principles include "every possible permutation" in his definition of the letter and spirit and of the various senses.[45] Despite the scope of his work, the translations, homilies, commentaries, and particularly the Vulgate, his influence on typological exegesis was slight; for from Origen, Jerome inherited a fairly well established tradition which had already allotted typology a minor role in scriptural interpretation. Further, as Wolfson makes clear, "Jerome believed that with the coming of Christ only the moral commands of the Old Testament . . . were still to be

---

"literal" (littera) and "mystical" (mysticus) and in another place he speaks only of historical (fundamenta historiae) and spiritual (spirituale) and still in another place he speaks only of historical (juxta historiam) and tropological (tropologiae summa)."

[44] To avoid confusion with the Jungian meaning of anagogic (relating to the moral or allegorical tendencies of the unconscious), modern biblical scholars invariable use the term eschatology to refer to the "doctrines of the last things."

[45] L. Schade, "Die Inspirationslehre des heiligen Hieronymus," Biblische Studien (1910), IV, 110.

obeyed . . ." (p. 67). Hence, in many cases, the type-antitype construct testified only to the predictive character of the Old Testament and to the unity of history; it might also be related to the allegorical and mystical senses, but only peripheral~~ly~~. Although Jerome specifically condemns the "extravagant allegories" of Origen, as Farrar has shown, "his allegoric interpretation [is] no less arbitrary" (p. 232). In its essential outlines, the typology of Jerome is the typology of Origen; the introduction of the term *tropologia* and the somewhat more consistent use of a fourth level of interpretation do not make any substantive changes in Jerome's practice of typology.

Next to that of the Bible itself, Perry Miller suggests that Augustine "exerted the greatest single influence upon Puritan thought . . .";[46] that influence, however, did not extend into the realm of typology, for Augustine's typological exegesis is that of Origen, and it is to the latter that the Puritans, particularly Samuel Mather and Edward Taylor, most often refer. Moreover, Augustine was even less systematic in his exegesis than Jerome, although Augustine is often mistakenly identified as the exclusive author of the four-fold sense of interpretation. As Wolfson makes clear, Augustine "favors fourfold classifications of _various kinds_ [italics added]" (p. 68). In several instances, Augustine identifies a four-fold method identical to the one Jerome presents in the _Second Commentary on Amos_:

---

[46] Perry Miller, "The Augustinian Strain of Piety," *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: 1939), I, 4. It may be, however, that Miller has overestimated the influence of Augustine. Although his name is continually cited by many of the leading Puritan writers, it is always Augustinianism seen through a Puritan prism. Further, Augustine was the first major Patristic commentator in whom the traditions of the previous 400 years found expression; he was as much of a preserver as an innovator. In many cases, the material Augustine presents, as in the case of typology, simply represents a restatement of Church tradition. Because Augustine's name looms large in intellectual history, however, a number of literary critics have been misled in an estimation of his influence. In *Edward Taylor's Treatise Concerning the Lord's Supper*, ed. Norman S. Grabo (Lansing, Michigan:

1966), for example, Taylor cites from the works of Augustine eleven times. But he also cites from ten other Patristic commentators, eight of whom wrote in the four centuries before Augustine: Origen, Optatus, Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, John Chrysostom, St. Basil, Jerome, and St. Gregory the Great. Taylor incorporates in his treatise eleven citations from Origen, five from Theophlyact, two each from Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, Jerome, and one citation each from the remaining four. Such a list strongly suggests that, at least in the case of Taylor's treatise, Augustine was not as influential as may first appear, particularly when one remembers his demonstrable dependance upon the works of Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, Origen, and Jerome. Finally, for a ministerial class so dependent upon a knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, Augustine's ignorance of Hebrew would have been inexcusable, particularly when the story of St. Jerome's risking excommunication in order to learn Hebrew from a Palestinian rabbi was so widely known. There is something almost symbolic in the fact that William Bradford, as an old man, began his study of Hebrew, wanting, above all, to know the "sweetness" of the original language.

> Senses are multiplied in four ways: (1) according to the sensus historicus or literalis, by a simple explanation of the words; (2) according to the sensus tropologicus, which looks to instruction or to the correction of morals . . . ; (3) according to the sensus allegoricus . . . [which is exposition] by a "sense other than the literal . . ."; (4) [and] the sensus anagogicus, used mystically or openly, [so that] "the minds of the listeners are . . . stirred and exhorted to the contemplation of heavenly things."[47]

In De Utilitate Credendi, however, Augustine says that "all Scripture . . . is handed down fourfold . . . , according to history, according to aetiology [a description of causes or origins], according to analogy, [and] according to allegory."[48] And in De Vera Religione, as Wolfson notes, Augustine enumerates, in addition to the literal sense, four kinds of allegory: the allegory of history (historiae), the allegory of facts (facti), the allegory of discourse (sermonis), and the allegory of rites (sacramenti) (p. 69). Erich Auerbach is misleading when he asserts that

> Augustine emphatically rejected the purely allegorical interpretation of the Holy Scriptures and dismissed the notion that the Old Testament was a kind of hermetic book that became intelligible only if one discarded the literal historical meaning. . . .[49]

---

[47] Cited in Harry Caplan, "The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching," Speculum (July, 1929), IV, 283.

[48] Cited in Wolfson, p. 68.

[49] Erich Auerbach, "Figura," Scenes from the Drama of European Literature (New York: 1959), p. 39.

Augustine did insist on the historicity of the literal text:

> Before all things, brethren, we admonish and command you in the name of the Lord, that when you hear an exposition of the mystery of the Scriptures telling of things that took place, you believe what is read to have actually taken place as the reading narrates; lest, undermining the foundation of actuality, you seek as it were to build in the air.[50]

Yet, Augustine's insistence, taken within the context of his debt to Origen and Jerome, and within the context of his own description of the differing allegorical senses, is not as emphatic as Auerbach implies; for as Augustine well knew, and as his practice demonstrates, there are certain texts which by their very nature demand a non-literal interpretation. Further, as G. L. Keyes makes clear, Augustine brings certain *a priori* commitments to his interpretation of scripture; any passage which, in its literal sense, does not accord with Augustine's dogmatic assumptions can be interpreted according to a "deeper meaning."[51] In trying to meet the problems posed by the various immoral episodes in Samson's life, for example, Augustine, following Justin Martyr, Origen, Jerome and others, identifies Samson as a type of Christ, and simply discards the literal meaning of the text. Samson lied to his friends; he also lay with a harlot. Augustine notes that "the justice of this man lies hidden in the depths." Since it is written that "he submitted to the charms of women and that he went to a harlot, his righteousness must indeed appear dubious to those who are only *partially aware of the secrets of the truth*" [italics added].[52]

---

[50] *De Trinitate*, cited in Auerbach, p. 39.

[51] G. L. Keyes, *Christian Faith and the Interpretation of History: A Study of St. Augustine's Philosophy of History* (Lincoln, Nebraska: 1966), p. 118. Keyes' analysis of Augustine's "rejection" of Philo's allegorizing clearly indicates Augustine's debt to Origen (who in turn, as we have seen, was the leading exponent of Philonian allegory), and (Auerbach notwithstanding) his tendency to allegorize scripture according to his precommitment to doctrine: "Philo claims that Noah's ark is a type of the

---

human body. In St. Augustine's opinion, it is a type of Christ, who came to save us from the floods of worldliness. It is true, however, that since Christ came in a human body, the ark might be thought a type of this, too. In fact, the proportions assigned to the ark are those traditionally attributed to the human body, the length (or height) being six times the breadth and ten times the thickness. Christ may be taken as Man, or at any rate New Man, *par excellence*. Philo's chief blunder lies in his identification of the door of the ark with the lower apertures of the human body. If the veil had been lifted from his eyes, he would have seen that the door represents the riven side of Christ from which the sacraments of the Church flow down. Christ and Church are one flesh, as Groom and Bride, and for that reason, the ark may also be taken as a type of the church." And Keyes concludes: "Where Philo and others differ from St. Augustine, they are said to be guilty of 'ingenious perversions'" (pp. 118-119). For similar statements of Augustine's dogmatism,see R. L. P. Milburn, "God's Judgement in History: Augustine, Orosius and Salvian," *Early Christian Interpretations of History* (London: 1954), pp. 74ff.; and Etienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine* (New York: 1960), particularly "Contemplating God in His Works," pp. 185ff.

[52] "On Samson; Judges 13-16," *Selected Sermons of St. Augustine*, trans. Quincy Howe, Jr. (New York: 1966), pp. 118ff.

Augustine then completely discards the literal sense, using a standard formula which he commonly applies in such cases: "We can say that in the Old Testament such things were neither criminal nor worthy of censure, for whatever was done or said was prophecy."[53]

Except for minor differences, Augustine's typology is that of Jerome; Jerome's is that of Origen. Although the four-fold division appears in Augustine's writing and is probably influenced by Jerome's hermeneutic principles, the system which dominated the next 1,000 years of biblical exegesis is not formally systematized by either. John Cassian is apparently the first Patristic commentator to append to the work of Jerome and Augustine "a complete terminology."[54] As Chydenius notes:

> The first sense he [Cassian] terms historia, employing an expression which had been used in reference to the literal sense ever since Origen. The second, the moral sense, which had already been discerned by Origen, Cassian calls tropologia, using a term that was given this signification by Jerome. The third sense . . . is called allegoria by Cassian, who in this follows the example of Jerome. Finally, the fourth sense is that which refers to eternal things. It had first been

---

[53] Selected Sermons, p. 119. Augustine's relation to the complex Renaissance traditions associated with the Samson figure is traced fully (as I have noted in the Introduction) in F. Michael Krouse, Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition (Princeton: 1949).

[54] Chydenius, p. 34. Caplan also asserts that the four-fold method was apparently first systematized by Cassian (pp. 285-86).

> discerned by Origen, and later by Jerome. Now Cassian [following Augustine and Jerome] gives it its own name, that of anagoge (p. 34).

Subsequent commentators adopt the four-fold method, repeating the traditional Latin distich which distinguishes the four senses:

> Litera gesta docet; quid credas, Allegoria:
> Moralis quid agas: quo tendas, Anagogica.
> [The letter teaches the event; allegory what you should believe:
> Moral what you should do: anagogic where you may go.]

The standard illustration of the four senses is the term Jerusalem. Literally, Jerusalem is a city; morally, it signifies virtue; allegorically, it is the church; and anagogically, it is heaven, the holy city of the end of time. In such a climate as this, the relatively restricted use of the typology of the New Testament, or even the more expansive interpretations of Justin Martyr, could not flourish as a distinct means of exegesis; it became so completely subordinated to the more "spiritual" levels of interpretation that the basic distinctions between typology and allegory were no longer observed. Further, as the Church became less sensitive to attacks on the value of the Old Testament to the Christian faith, typology soon ceased to be a means of apologetic. As Auerbach comments, figural interpretation

> . . . changed the Old Testament from a book of laws and a history of the people of Israel into a series

> of figures of Christ and the Redemption. . . . In this form and in this context, from which Jewish history and national character had vanished, the Celtic and Germanic peoples, for example, could accept the Old Testament; it was a part of the universal religion of salvation and a necessary component of the equally magnificent and universal vision of history that was conveyed to them along with this religion. In its original form, as a law book and history of so foreign and remote a nation, it would have been beyond their reach (p. 52).

In this process, typology played an early, essential role; when Christianity became Hellenized, however, typology ceased to be a central part of biblical exegesis. As a matter of fact, the major stages of the evolutionary process of the first five centuries A. D. will be repeated in a single century in New England Puritanism.

The previous discussion has traced, essentially, the evolution of typology as it is related to the developing theories of hermeneutics, first in relation to Philonian allegory and then in its less complex stages in the first Patristic commentators to its position in the early Latin Fathers. Although this development is clearly related to the evolution of the four-fold method when typology is viewed as a method of biblical exegesis, the same kind of process occurs in relation to the imagery associated with specific type-antitype constructs. By tracing the typological aspects of the Exodus story from the New Testament authors to Augustine, for example, one can see the interaction between exegetical theory and typological imagery.[55] Exodus typology, as is the case with most types, has its roots in the prophetic passages in the Old Testament, particularly in Isaiah:

> Thus saith the Lord, which maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters;
> Which bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the power; they shall lie down together, they shall not rise: they are extinct, they are quenched as tow.
> Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old.
> Behold, I will do a new thing . . .; I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert (43: 16-20).

The new Exodus will have all of the features of the old. The children of Israel will again cross a sea; they will again march through the wilderness, but this time in triumph (Isaiah 52: 12); living water will again pour from the rock (Isaiah 48: 21-22); and as Jeremiah asserts, God will establish with them a new covenant:

> Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel. . . .
> Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt. . . .
> But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts,

---

[55] For the information in my discussion of the Exodus typology, I am indebted to Jean Daniélou (From Shadows to Reality) who has summarized the biblical criticism relating to this aspect of typology, and who has provided an index of the baptismal commentaries of the early Church Fathers (see pp. 153-226).

> and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.
>
> Thus saith the Lord which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The Lord of hosts is his name (31: 31-35).

In predicting the future course of Hebrew history, the prophets consciously adapt their visions to the characteristics of the first Exodus. They add, however, that the new Exodus will be superior to the old (Isaiah 43: 16), that it will be of a spiritual character (Jeremiah 31: 33), and that a new Moses will come who will be called the Messiah, for he shall deliver his people from bondage.

Such is the essential outline of the new Exodus which New Testament writers inherited. Of all of the New Testament books, the Gospel of Matthew most consciously identifies Christ as fulfilling the Old Testament prophecies regarding the new Exodus and the Messiah. In identifying Bethlehem as the scene of the nativity, Matthew notes "for thus it is written by the prophet: . . . for out of thee [Bethlehem] shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel" (2: 5-6). According to Matthew, an angel instructed Joseph to flee into Egypt to escape Herod's wrath, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son" (2: 15). Again, according to Matthew, Joseph returned to Galilee after Herod's death and settled in

Nazareth, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene" (2: 23). But it is in the episode of Christ's baptism and temptation that Matthew most fully draws the parallels between Christ's mission and the first Exodus. Isaiah had identified the New Exodus as a triumphant march; Matthew reveals John the Baptist as the herald of this triumph: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord" (3: 3). Immediately after His baptism, which corresponds to the crossing of the Red Sea, Christ is "led by the Spirit into the desert" (4: 1), where, in the first Exodus, the people of Israel had undergone numerous trials. The author of Deuteronomy had expressly warned the Hebrews to

> . . . remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments, or no.
>
> And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna . . . that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord . . . (8: 2-3).

Christ's temptation, in Matthew's gospel, explicitly parallels this passage in Deuteronomy. Christ is led into the desert to be tempted; he remains there for forty days and forty nights, an obvious allusion to the forty years the children of Israel wandered in the desert. Christ hungers and, when tempted to change the stones into bread, answers by citing the deuteronomic passage: "Man does not live by bread alone" (Matthew 4: 3). The final temptation on the high mountain parallels Moses's experiences on Sinai; when tempted by Satan to worship him, Christ's reply is taken from the Decalogue revealed to Moses on Sinai: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (10: 3).[56] The basic characteristics of the Exodus type-antitype are established in Matthew according to the framework outlined by the prophets; Patristic commentators take up where Matthew leaves off, adding, according to their own principles of exegesis, further elaboration.

There are no extant discussions of Exodus typology as such in the catechetical homilies (such as the Didache) and writings of the Fathers of the first two centuries which add any major details to the ones presented in Matthew's Gospel.[57] According to Per Lundberg, because

---

[56] The basic characteristics of the new Exodus are presented in The Gospel of Matthew; in the other gospels, in the book of Acts, and in the epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter, some of the characteristics presented by Matthew are repeated and a few additional parallels are drawn. For a full discussion of the new Exodus in the gospels and epistles, see Leonhard Goppelt, Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie (Guttersloh: 1939), XLIII, especially pp. 70ff.

[57] Much of the material regarding the Exodus, particularly the crossing of the Red Sea as a type of baptism, is presented in relation to instructions for administering

Exodus typology was most commonly associated with the rite of baptism, it remained codified during the first centuries in baptismal liturgies, most of them a part of the lost oral traditions of the early church. He notes, however, that in an early Arabic text, Testamentum Domini, the early Christians "invoque le Dieu dont la puissance s'est manifester dans la création, qui a sauvé ceux qui se trouvaient dans l'arc qui a aidé Israël à traverser la Mer Rouge et le Jourdain . . . ,"[58] indicating that the Exodus myth was quite early incorporated within the traditions of the Church. The first major discussion of the Exodus occurs in Tertullian's De Baptismo Liber (c. 200 A. D.); it is the first extant homily which unites the crossing of the Red Sea and the rock which gushes forth water with baptism:

> . . . when the people [of Israel] are set free from bondage in Egypt and by passing through the water are escaping the violence of the Egyptian king, the king himself with all his forces is destroyed by water. This is a type made abundantly clear in the sacred act of baptism: I mean that the gentiles are set free from this present world by means of water, and leave behind, drowned in the water,

---

the rite itself. Justin Martyr's First Apology makes a passing reference to the type and presents the tripartite baptismal formula, but his work is designed primarily as an instructional manual (as is the Didache) and does not aim at any complex typological analysis (see Wolfson, pp. 143ff.).

[58] Per Lundberg, La Typologie baptismal de l'ancienne église, Acta Seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis (Leipzig: 1942), X, 10ff.

> their ancient tyrant the devil. . . . This is [also] the water which flowed forth for the people from the rock . . . : and as that rock was Christ, without doubt this shows us that baptism is made blessed in Christ by water.[59]

Philo, following earlier Jewish commentators, had previously identified the Egyptians with the "evil passions"; Tertullian simply adapts the Jewish interpretation to the source of evil. Tertullian also introduces another aspect of the Exodus baptismal typology which will appear in subsequent commentaries. After escaping from the Egyptians, the Hebrews wandered in the desert "for three days and found no water" (Exodus 15: 22). When they came to a spring called Marah, "they could not drink of the waters . . . for they were bitter."

> And the people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink?
>
> And he cried unto the Lord: and the Lord shewed him a tree, which when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet: there he made for them a statute and an ordinance . . . (15: 24-25).

According to Tertullion, who unites the waters and the wood from the tree,

> that tree was Christ, who from within himself heals the springs of that nature which was previously poisoned and embittered, [converting them] into exceedingly healthful water, that of baptism (p. 21).

---

[59] Tertullian's Homily on Baptism, ed. Ernest Evans (London: 1964), pp. 19-21.

Origen's analysis of the baptismal significance of the Exodus in the Homily on Exodus (c. 225) is perhaps the single most influential treatise of the Exodus cultus, for his interpretations, as well as his three-fold method of exegesis, will establish an Exodus interpretative tradition associated with Alexandrian allegory. Origen does not develop in any detail the sacramental aspects of the crossing of the Red Sea; he does, however, add his own interpretation to St. Paul's statement in I Corinthians that "all passed through the sea . . . and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea . . ." (10: 1-2). Adapting the passage to his three-fold schema, Origen comments on the difference between the "purely historical narrative and St. Paul's interpretation." According to Origen, "Paul calls the crossing of the Red Sea a Baptism"; he then adds an interpretation which is not in the Epistle, although it may be implied: ". . . where they were thought to be beneath a cloud Paul sees the Holy Spirit."[60] Unlike Tertullian, Origen finds a "mystical" significance in the three days' journey to the waters of Marah:

> Pharaoh did not [want to] allow the children of Israel to go forward to the place of signs [Marah], and wished to prevent them advancing till they could enjoy the mysteries of the third day. . . . The first day is for the Lord's Passion; the second that of the descent into hell, the third that of the Resurrection. That is why, on this third

---

[60] Cited in Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, p. 186.

> day, God will go before them, by day a pillar of cloud, and by night a pillar of fire. If . . . the Apostle rightly teaches us that these words enshrine the mystery of baptism, then it will follow that "those who are baptized in Christ Jesus are baptized into his death and buried with him" (Rom. 6: 3), and rise with him on the third day. When you have made your own the mystery of the third day, God will begin to lead you . . . himself to show you the way of salvation (Daniélou, p. 186).

Origen sees the pursuing Egyptians as a type of the devils straining to keep the soul from baptism, as the "rulers of this world," and, in the Philonian tradition, as the "evil passions." To Origen, the literal level of the narrative is obviously established by the clear antitypical reference in I Corinthians; in the "moral" and "mystical" meanings, however, typology is subordinated to Alexandrian allegory, one clear mark of which is Origen's mystical interpretation of the "mysteries of the third day." The same is true of the crossing of the Red Sea; the primary focus of his analysis is not on the type-antitype identification of St. Paul, but upon the crossing of the sea as an allegory of the struggle between the "flesh and spirit" in the baptismal candidate. Unlike Tertullian, Origen sees the transformation of the bitter waters of Marah as the "literal sense of the Law, spiritualized and made drinkable by Moses' rod . . . , which is the wisdom of Christ"; he does not comment on the water gushing from the rock. In a later work, The Commentary on St. John, Origen relates another "crossing" to baptism and, thereby, introduces for the first time a new typical identification which will become increasingly important to subsequent commentators. In discussing John's account of Christ's baptism in the Jordan River, he notes that

> when Paul read this passage [I Corinthians 10] . . . he taught us to interpret spiritually the passage of the Red Sea. . . . In the spirit of this passage let us also pray that we may receive from God power to understand the spiritual meaning of Joshua's passage through the Jordan. Of it, also, Paul might have written "I would not have you ignorant, that all our fathers went through the Jordan, and were baptized into Jesus in the spirit and in the river." And Joshua, who succeeded Moses was a type of Jesus Christ.[61]

As early as Justin Martyr, both Moses and his successor Joshua (whose Greek name is Jesus) had been viewed as types of Christ; Origen combines the traditions reflected in such passages as Tertullian's discussion of the crossing of the sea and Justin's identification of personal types, and applies both to identify the typical crossing of the river Jordan with the sacrament of baptism.[62]

---

[61] From Shadows to Reality, p. 262.

[62] As Lundberg notes (pp. 29ff.), Origen also relates the story of Joshua's crossing to an earlier incident in relation to the Jordan. In II Kings, in the account of Elisha's succession to Elijah's prophetic role, just before Elijah's ascension, the two men stand on the banks of the Jordan: "And Elijah took his mantle, and wrapped it together, and smote the waters, and they were divided . . . so that they two went over on dry ground" (2: 8). Although Origen does not insist on the point, his implication is clear: As Moses and Joshua were both types

More than any other early commentator, Eusebius of Caesarea concentrates on the types in the Exodus account which prefigure the historical narrative of Christ's life, primarily as it is recorded in the Gospel of Matthew. Unlike Origen, Eusebius had little use for Alexandrian allegory. Eusebius' account of the Exodus typology is, as R. L. P. Milburn says of his Ecclesiastical History, "straightforward chronicle."[63] Two major concerns dominate De Demonstrationes Evangelicae: first, Eusebius wishes to demonstrate the historicity of the typological approach, and in his attempts he repeats typical identifications found in Matthew and introduces several new type-antitype identifications. He repeats the prophecies which attest to Jesus as the Messiah as Matthew has recorded them and he compares the Temptation to the wilderness journey. He introduces, however, a parallel which is not found in earlier commentators: Moses giving the Law on Mt. Sinai is the type of Christ giving the New Law in the Sermon on the Mount:

> Moses delivered the Jewish people from their intolerable slavery to the Egyptians. Jesus Christ freed the whole human race and delivered it from the wicked idolatry of Egypt, where evil demons

---

of Christ, so also are Elijah and Elisha. (See also, From Shadows to Reality, pp. 229-243).

[63] R. L. P. Milburn, Early Christian Interpretations of History (London: 1954), p. 54.

> held it down. Moses promised the Holy Land to those who kept the Law. Jesus Christ has said: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," promising a land which is far better and truly holy; not that of Judea which is like all others, but one which is in heaven and fit for those who love God and live as he has taught them to live.[64]

Eusebius compares the forty fast days of Moses with that of Jesus (Luke 4: 1-2), the crossing of the Red Sea with Christ's walking on the water, Moses commanding the wind and the sea and Christ stilling the tempest, the face of Moses on Sinai and the resplendence of Christ's face in the Transfiguration, the manna with the miracle of the loaves and fishes (Luke 5: 6ff.) and so on. More importantly, however, as these parallels indicate, Eusebius' major purpose is to establish the typical relationship of Moses and Christ, and to demonstrate that the new covenant is superior to the old:

> Moses was the first to rule the Jewish people, and to turn them aside from the idolatrous and superstitious practices of Egypt. . . . He again was the first to teach them the doctrine of the one God. He was the first to lay down ordinances and precepts for a holy life, and thus revealed himself as their first and supreme Legislator. But Jesus Christ in a higher and more excellent fashion than Moses was the first to teach all nations the true faith, and to bring about the overthrow of idolatry in the whole world, and to proclaim to all men the knowledge and worship of the Supreme God and to be the initiator and legislator of a new life . . . (Daniélou, pp. 197-198).

---

[64] Cited in Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, p. 199.

Except for his numerous new identifications of the parallels between Moses and Christ, in many ways Eusebius is not typical of other fourth century commentators. Quasten suggests that the Demonstrationes are primarily the result of Constantine's conversion and his declaration that Christianity was the official state religion.[65] Eusebius' repeated attacks on pagan idolatry and his celebration of the universality of the Christian faith would suggest such a purpose.

In addition to Eusebius, five major commentators of the fourth century contribute to the Exodus typology: St. Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory, Didymus the Blind, and St. Ambrose. Although their writings on typology all occur within a period of slightly less than twenty years (from 375 to 394), there are significant differences in their works; for it is in the first decade of the fourth century that the School of Antioch was "founded . . . in direct opposition to the excesses and fantasies of the allegorical method of Origen" and the School of Alexandria.[66] St. Basil, called the "Father of Orthodoxy," was a member of the Council which condemned Origen as an heretic; he makes clear in his commentaries on Genesis, In Hexameron, that Alexandrian allegory has no place in scriptural interpretation:

---

[65] Patrology: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature, From the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon, III, 310.

[66] Quasten, III, 121.

> I know the laws of allegory, though not from my own works but from the works of others. Some preachers do not concede the ordinary sense of the Scriptures. They will not call water water, but something else. They interpret a plant or fish as their fancy wishes. They change the nature of the reptiles and wild beasts to fit their allegories, like those who explain . . . dreams to suit their own ends. When I hear the word grass, I understand that grass is meant.[67]

Cyril of Jerusalem is also an adherent of the principles of the Antiochene school. In his Catecheses on baptism, for example, although he is aware of the complex traditions which Origen fostered, Cyril's discussion of the significance of baptism is based primarily on a literal interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and the Gospel of St. John. Both men are the leading figures in the fourth century who adhere rather closely to the methods of the School of Antioch. Following Paul's identification of Christ as the Second Adam (I Corinthians, 15: 45), St. Basil, for example, in his matter-of-fact approach proves himself an exegetical disciple of Eusebius, whose bishopric he inherited. Citing scripture for each of his typical identifications, St. Basil asserts that all the events of the Old Testament have their own historical reality and are to be interpreted literally:

---

[67] Cited in Quasten, II, 217.

> The type is a manifestation of things to come through an imitation allowing us to see in advance the things of the future in such wise that they can be understood. Adam is thus a "figure of him who is to come," the rock is Christ typically, and the water from the rock is the type of the quickening power of the Logos: *if anyone thirst, let him come to me and drink*; the manna is the type of the living bread "which is come down from heaven"; the serpent set up on the [staff] is a type of the saving Passion which was finished on the Cross. And equally, the narrative of the Exodus of Israel envisages those who are saved by Baptism. . . . The sea and the cloud . . . prefigure as types the grace that is to come. . . . In the sea was the enemy slain, and in the waters of Baptism our enmity with God is destroyed. The people came forth from the sea whole and unscathed. While we come up from the waters as living from the dead, saved by the grace of him who called us.[68]

In *Procatechesis* St. Cyril also asserts the historicity of the Exodus account by placing baptism within the context of the setting of the Passover and by drawing precise parallels, based on scriptural precedent, between the Passover and the Passion:

> You must know that this type [baptism] is found in ancient history. For when . . . Pharaoh oppressed . . . the Hebrews, God sent Moses to bring them out of the evil thraldom of the Egyptians. The door-posts were anointed with the blood of the lamb, that the Destroyer might pass by those houses which had the sign of the blood. And so the Hebrew people were marvellously delivered. . . . Now turn from the ancient to the recent, from the type to the reality. There we have Moses sent from God to Egypt, here, Christ sent by his Father into the world: there Moses had to lead forth an oppressed

---

[68] *De Spiritu Sancto*, cited in Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, pp. 188-189.

> people out of Egypt; here, Christ rescues mankind when overwhelmed with sin: there, the blood of the lamb was the spell against the Destroyer; here, the blood of the unblemished Lamb, Jesus Christ, puts the demons to flight. . . . The tyrant of old was drowned in the sea, and the present tyrant is destroyed in the saving water (Daniélou, p. 183).

St. Basil and St. Cyril do not discard previous typological interpretations which, from their point of view, are firmly based on scriptural precedent and a literal reading of the text. Nor do they avoid moralizing typology for the benefit of their catechumens; but they carefully avoid the methods of Alexandrian allegory.

On the other hand, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind, and St. Ambrose are closely associated with the exegetical methods of the School of Alexandria. St. Gregory, as Quasten notes, was strongly influenced by the "linguistic jugglery . . . and eccentric characteristics of contemporary Greek rhetoric" (III, 255). In his major dogmatic treatise, Oratio catechetica magna, he "adopted not only his [Origen's] exegetic system, but also many of his dogmatic opinions."[69] Didymus was head of the catechetical school of Alexandria and continued the exegetical traditions associated with that school, acknowledging

---

[69] Farrar, p. 202. Farrar also notes that St. Gregory was "the most Origenising of all the Fathers of the Nicene age. . . ." (See also Quasten, III, 262ff.; and The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, Second Series [Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1954], V, especially pp. 14ff., "Gregory of Nyssa: His Origenism.")

Origen as the "master exegete." He defended Origen in the Origenistic controversies which erupted throughout the fourth century, and he declared that Origen's De principiis was completely orthodox, after the work had been condemned by the Council.[70] St. Ambrose is also an advocate of Origenistic allegory and even in his own day was subject to criticism for his highly subjective interpretations of New Testament events. St. Jerome says of Ambrose's commentaries on Matthew and Luke that "the latter trifles in the words and drowses in the meanings and the other is dull in both."[71] In explaining the significance of the silver and gold threads in the high priest's robes, for example, Ambrose says that "it is certain that by refined gold and silver are designated the oracles of the Lord. . . ." The four colors of the robe represent the four elements: "Now blue is like the air we breathe . . .; purple, again, represents the appearance of water; scarlet signifies fire; and white linen, earth. . . ." And he concludes: "Of these four elements . . . the human body is composed."[72] The colors ultimately come to represent the "bodily acts agreeing" with faith.

---

[70] Quasten, III, 87. Didymus was surnamed "the Blind" because of physical blindness.

[71] Cited in Farrar, p. 205.

[72] "Of the Christian Faith," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, Second

The interpretations of the Exodus account by Gregory, Didymus, and Ambrose stand in direct contrast to the Antiochene principles underlying the interpretations of St. Basil and Cyril of Jerusalem. In his sermon, "On the Baptism of Christ," St. Gregory allots a very minor role to the Exodus account; the crossing of the Red Sea is only one of a long list of types of baptism. St. Basil might well have been commenting on Gregory's sermon when he (Basil) says that some interpreters "will not call water water, but something else"; for Gregory, like Justin Martyr, combs the Old Testament for every text relating to water and identifies it as a type of baptism. When Abraham sent Hagar and Ishmael to wander in the wilderness, Gregory comments upon the sacramental typology of the incident:

> . . . And when she was in straits for the needs of life . . . for the water in the skin was spent (since it was not possible that the Synagogue [allegorically Hagar represents the Jewish faith, and Abraham's wife Sarah, the Christian] . . . should have all that was needed to support life), an angel unexpectedly appears, and shows her a well of living water, and drawing thence, she saves Ishmael. Behold, then, a sacramental type: how from the very first it is by means of living water that salvation comes to him that was perishing. . . .[73]

Series (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1955), X, 224ff. Ambrose's elaborate interpretation of the twelve gems on the high priest's breastplate also appears in this section.

[73] The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, V, 521.

Gregory then lists the following types of baptism: when Isaac finds his bride Rebekah at a well baptism is prefigured; when jealous herdsmen fill up Isaac's wells their actions prefigure "those impious men . . . who hinder the grace of Baptism"; Jacob meeting Rachel at a well, the baby Moses being placed in a basket in the river, and so on, "type the sacrament of Baptism." Gregory's specific comments on the Exodus occur in the same context:

> . . . according to the view of the inspired Paul, the people itself, by passing through the Red Sea, proclaimed the good tidings of salvation by water. The people passed over, and the Egyptian king with his host was engulfed, and by these actions this Sacrament was foretold. For even now, whensoever the people is in the water of regeneration, fleeing from Egypt, from the burden of sin, it is set free and saved; but the devil with his own servants . . . is choked with grief, and perishes, deeming the salvation of men to be his own misfortune (p. 522).

In the Life of Moses, however, Gregory interprets, following Origen, the Egyptian forces as representing the passions:

> Do you not see that the Egyptian army, and all its forces, horses, chariots and their riders, archers, slingers, and foot soldiers--all these are the various passions of the soul to which man yields? All these powers cast themselves into the water after the Hebrews whom they pursue. But the water, by the power of the wood of faith and of the luminous cloud becomes the beginning of life for those who seek refuge there and the beginning of death for their attackers.[74]

---

[74] Cited in Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, pp. 187-188.

Unlike St. Basil who focuses upon the typological contrasts between Moses and Christ, Gregory restates many of Origen's interpretations, including the crossing of the river Jordan as a type of baptism. More so than Origen, however, Gregory ignores the literal and historical characteristics of the Old Testament texts he cites.

In their comments on Exodus typology, both Didymus and Ambrose share two characteristics which develop in the fourth century and become a part of the Traditions of the Church: the "mystery" of baptism as a sacrament, and the priest's role in performing the mystery. Both characteristics are the result of Origen's introduction of a third level of interpretation, the mystical, and of his concept of the "graduated" levels of meaning as paralleling the capabilities of the interpreter. In De Trinitate, for example, Didymus emphasizes the miracle of the type:

> When Moses sweetened the waters [of Marah] with his staff, he proclaimed before hand the salvation of all mankind. For he was a type of Christ; his staff was a type of the Cross; the bitter waters were a type of the water of the Pool of Bethsaida [John 5: 7], of no avail to those without faith, but in which those who had faith found their healing (Daniélou, pp. 171-172).

In De Sacramentis St. Ambrose further underlines the ritual aspects of the incident at the waters of Marah:

> You see the mystery. Moses is the prophet; the rod is the word of God. The priest strikes the rock with the word of God: the water flows and

> the people of God drink. And the priest touches the cup, water streams into the cup, springing up into eternal life.[75]

After listing the traditional types of baptism--Noah's ark, the crossing of the Red Sea and the river Jordan--Ambrose returns to the significance of Moses' actions at Marah, identifying the waters explicitly with the baptismal font and adding to previous commentators by identifying the Moses-Christ-priest succession:

> Marah was a fountain of most bitter water: Moses cast wood into it and it became sweet. For water without the preaching of the Cross of the Lord is of no avail for future salvation, but, after it has been consecrated by the mystery of the saving cross, it is made suitable for the use of the spiritual laver and of the cup of salvation. As, then, Moses, that is, the prophet, cast wood into that fountain, so, too, the priest utters over this font the proclamation of the Lord's cross, and the water is made sweet for the purpose of grace (X, 319).

And, finally, Didymus and Ambrose interpret the Exodus account--the march of the Jews from the Red Sea through the desert to Mt. Sinai--as an allegory of the journey of the Christian soul to God.[76]

---

[75] The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, X, 318.

[76] Daniélou rarely criticizes the allegorism of Patristic commentators, for he insists that much of the allegory is a legitimate extension of the literal sense, and has, in fact, ample New Testament precedent. Regarding the Alexandrians as a group, however, he admits that "while certain interpretations of details . . . are a legitimate extension of the literal sense, many others are purely allegorical and have no other foundations" (From Shadows to Reality, p. 226).

Near the end of the fourth century, the last major exponent of the Antiochene principles of exegesis, St. John Chrysostom, attempts to establish general principles of typological exegesis which will combat the extravagances of Alexandrian allegory. In his commentary on I Corinthians 10 (from which nearly all interpretations of Exodus typology begin), Chrysostom attempts to define the exact relationship of the type and antitype:

> How is that crossing of the Red Sea the type of future Baptism? I will explain this when you understand what is a type and what the reality. . . . Let us take the example of a picture. You have often seen the portrait of a King, sketched in black; the painter fills in the outlines showing the King, the royal theme, horses, bodyguards at his side, his enemies in chains at his feet. From what you see portrayed you cannot know everything, and yet you are not entirely ignorant. You know in a general way that it is about a King and a horse. But who the King is, and who is his enemy, you do not know with any certainty until the colouring itself makes the outlines more clear and distinct.[77]

Up to this point Chrysostom's comments are quite traditional; numerous commentators have compared the type to a "shadow," an "outline," a "framework," presented in general form, but indistinct in specific details. Chrysostom's conclusions, however, are quite different from the traditional conclusions:

---

[77] Cited in Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, p. 191. Subsequent page numbers refer to Daniélou's text.

> Now, just as in the case of the picture you do not expect to grasp everything before the colours are filled in, though even if you have only a general idea of what it is all about you think the outline sufficiently accurate, so, I say, should you think on the subject of the Old and New Testaments, and *not demand of the type all the exactness of the reality* [italics added] (p. 191).

Chrysostom's point is clear: because all commentators after Christ are in possession of the "reality," there is a temptation to "read into" the type (the rough outline of the picture) the full details which can only be ascertained by knowledge of the antitype. Chrysostom indicates, as St. Basil and Theodoret had previously done, that such practice is the basic characteristic of the subjectivism of the Alexandrians. The type, by its very nature, must remain fragmentary; it only "shadows forth"--not describes --the "fullness to come."

Chrysostom then applies his statement of general principle to the crossing of the Red Sea as a type of baptism:

> In both cases we are dealing with water--in one case water in a bath, in the other it is the sea, and in both cases you go down into the water. . . . Once they were delivered by the sea from Egypt; now it is the devil; once it was the Egyptians who were suffocated, now the ancient enemy is stifled beneath our sins. [If] the type need not have nothing in common to the antitype, then there would be nothing typical. Nor on the other [hand] has one to be identical with the other or it would be the reality itself. There must be that proportion, so that it neither possesses all that the reality has, nor is it entirely lacking. . . .

> [D]o not expect the Old Testament to explain everything, but even if you do find certain mysteries which are difficult and obscure, learn how to be satisfied.[78]

But Chrysostom makes clear that the antitype is different from and superior to the type:

> But there are differences; one is a delivery from the Egyptians, the other from devils: one a freedom from barbarians, the other from sin. They were of old called to freedom; so are we: yet not to the same freedom, for ours is one far higher (p. 192).

Chrysostom then continues the identification of types in the Pauline text, identifying the Eucharistic typology of verses 2-3: "And did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."

---

[78] I have modified Daniélou's translation (p. 192) as indicated by the brackets. Chrysostom's statement, as Daniélou translates it, reads: "The type need not have nothing in common to the antitype." But the statement is clearly conditional, as the conditional particle *si* and the context make clear: "Et vide cognationem figurae cum veritate, ac veritatis prae typo excellentiam. Neque enim onmino alienum oportet esse typum a veritate, alioquin enim typus non esset: neque rursum par est exaequari typum veritatei; alioquin typus ipsa veritas esset: sed in suo modo maneat oportet, neque omnia habeat, quae veritas habet, neque at toto excidat. Si enim totum haberet, ipsa veritas esset; si a toto excideret, non posset esse typus; sed oportet ut partem habeat, partum vertati reservet. Ne igitur in Veteri totum a me requiras: sed si qua parva et obscura acceperis aenigmata, tecum bene actum esse puta. Ubi itaque est cognatio typi cum veritate?" ("In Apostolicum Dictum," ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia, Series Graeca* [Paris: 1859], LI, 247-248).

> . . . Consider the various events, bearing in mind that they are only part of a rough outline. . . . Just as you . . . coming up out of the bath of water, hasten to the [Communion] table, so did they, coming up out of the sea, find a new and wonderful table, I mean the manna. And just as you have a wondrous drink, the cup of salvation, so did they; for even when there were no springs, or running waters, an abundance of water gushed forth from a dry and barren rock (p. 193).

This particular typology of the Eucharist is not usually found in the Alexandrines; as Danielou notes, this typology is primarily Pauline; the "typology" of Alexandria is based upon John's gospel, often called the "spiritual" gospel in contrast to the synoptics (p. 193). Yet the identification of the manna and rock is quite common in the Antiochenes. Theodoret, Chrysostom's predecessor, presents generally the same analysis.[79]

The conflict between the exegetical schools of Antioch and Alexandria was resolved in the fifth century, for the two schools could not long exist together. Although there was broad agreement on certain aspects of traditional exegesis, the proponents of the different schools were themselves convinced of an irreconcilable contradiction in their methods. Quasten succinctly summarizes the basic disagreements:

---

[79] Theodoret's identifications are not as fully developed as Chrysostom's; there is a certain "pell-mell" quality about Theodoret's style as well: "The sea is the type of the baptismal font, the cloud of the Holy Spirit, and Moses of Christ our Saviour; the staff is a type of the Cross; Pharaoh of the devil and the Egyptians of the fallen angels; manna of the divine food and the water from the rock of the Saviour's blood. Just as they enjoyed a wonderful refreshment coming from a miraculous source, after they had passed through the Red Sea, so we, after the saving waters of Baptism, share in the divine mysteries" (cited in Daniélou, p. 194).

> At Antioch the object was to find in Holy Writ its most obvious meaning; at . . . Alexandria the search was for figures of Christ. The one side accused allegory of destroying the value of the Bible . . . , of travestying it into mythological fable; the other dubbed "carnal" all who clung to the letter. . . . Origen discovers types not just in certain episodes, but in every detail of the inspired words. Each line is filled with mystery. On the other hand Antioch made it a fundamental principle to see figures of Christ just occasionally, not always, in the Old Testament. . . . Types were the exception, not the rule; the Incarnation was everywhere prepared, but not everywhere prefigured (II, 122).

The School of Antioch, with its emphasis on a rational approach to the Scriptures, was simply not in step with the times. The development of the four-fold level of interpretation presupposed a much broader approach than the Antiochenes could accept. Further, allegory encouraged the tendency for exegesis to be used as a support for Christian dogma. Church Tradition was gradually being formed in the third and fourth centuries, based in large part on the sacramenti ("mysteries") of the Bible; and the rationalistic tendencies of the Antiochenes were directly opposed to its development. Two individuals ultimately contributed to the disrepute of the School of Antioch. One of the first pupils of Lucian~~,~~ one of the founders of the school at Antioch, was Arius. The rationalistic tendencies of the school, exaggerated in Arius' teaching, led to the disapproval of the Church councils, and, in the Council of Nicaea, to the designation of Arianism as heresy.[80] The second person was St. Augustine.

Augustine viewed himself as a reconciler between the two traditions; as a matter of fact, however, his exegetical principles predisposed him to the Origenistic approach and his actual practice demonstrates his commitment to it. In _The City of God_, under the heading "Of the Ark and the Deluge, and that We cannot Agree with Those Who Receive the Bare History, but Reject the Allegorical Interpretation, nor with Those Who Maintain the Figurative and not the Historical Meaning,"[81] Augustine appears to support a position which would encompass the principles of both schools:

> . . . No one ought to suppose either that these things were written for no purpose, or that we should study only the historical truth, apart from any allegorical meanings; or, on the contrary,

---

[80] Quasten also identifies the relation of the two schools to classical thought, indicating further the reasons for condemnation: "Alexandria's idealism and speculative bent owed inspiration to Plato, Antioch's realism and empiricism to Aristotle; the former inclined to mysticism, the latter to rationalism"(II, 122).

[81] "The City of God," _The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers_, ed. Philip Schaff (_Grand Rapids, Michigan:_ 1956), _II, 307_. All page numbers refer to this edition.

> that they are only allegories, and that there were no such facts at all, or that, whether it be so or no, there is here no prophecy of the church.

His next sentence, however, indicates that the significance of scripture lies beyond "bare historical facts":

> For what right-minded man will contend that books so religiously preserved during thousands of years, and transmitted by so orderly a succession, were written without an object, or that only the bare historical facts are to be considered when we read them? (p. 307).

The "purpose" for which scripture was written, the "object" which underlies it, is that it indicates a "prophecy of the church"; and the interpretation of prophecy, even in the School of Antioch, was a legitimate approach to scripture. In "On Christian Doctrine," Augustine again returns to the same point:

> . . . When what is said figuratively is taken as if it were said literally, it is understood in a carnal manner. And nothing is more fittingly called the death of the soul than when that in it which raises it above the brutes, the intelligence namely, is put in subjection to the flesh by a blind adherence to the letter.[82]

In "On the Spirit and the Letter," Augustine, citing St. Paul's text ("The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life"), which Origen and Jerome had also cited as a defense of their methods, identifies the "letter" with the

---

[82] "On Christian Doctrine," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, II, 559.

Jewish Law and the Rabbinic commentaries, and the "spirit" with the message of the New Testament. Augustine asserts that

> a veil is placed on the reading of the Old Testament, until it shall be turned to Christ, and the veil be removed--in other words, until it shall be turned to grace, and be understood that *from Him accrues to us* the justification, whereby we do what He commands [italics added].[83]

Augustine concludes by citing II Corinthians 3: 6 to clarify what it is that Christ commands:

> . . . our sufficiency is of God; who hath also made us fit to be ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life (p. 484).

Such a principle is, as Chrysostom makes clear, inimical to typology, for it "demands of the type all the exactness of the reality," and invites an allegorical reading of any Old Testament passage.

It is true that Augustine insisted that allegorical readings should be based on the literal sense;[84] but as A. D. R. Polman notes, ". . . when it came to practical application, he was swayed by the thought of his times. . . . He often went too far, almost to the point of panallegorism."[85] In "On Christian Doctrine," for example, Augustine attempts to establish certain principles for interpreting figurative language in scripture. In the examples which he provides, however, his reading seems to ignore the very principles he tries to elucidate. In interpreting "Thy teeth are like a flock of sheep that are shorn, which came up from the washing, whereof every one bears twins, and none is barren among them" (Canticles, 4: 2), Augustine accepts the traditional interpretation that the beautiful woman being "complimented" is a symbol of the Church; from this identification he creates the following allegory:

---

[83] "On the Spirit and the Letter," *Basic Writings of Saint Augustine*, ed. Whitney J. Oates (New York: 1948), I, 484. It is this aspect of Augustine's thought which Farrar calls "the over-weening pretensions of sacerdotalism" (p. 235).

[84] "On Christian Doctrine," p. 543.

> . . . I feel greater pleasure in contemplating holy men, when I view them as the teeth of the Church, tearing men away from their errors, and bringing them into the Church's body, with all their harshness softened down, just as if they had been torn off and masticated by the teeth. It is with the greatest pleasure, too, that I recognize them under the _figura_ of the sheep that have been shorn, laying down the burthens of the world like fleeces, and coming up from the washing, _i.e._, from baptism, and all bearing twins, _i.e._, the twin commandments of love, and none among them barren in that holy fruit (p. 537).

Auerbach is incorrect when he asserts that "the only reason [_typus_] fell behind _figura_ is that it was a foreign word" (p. 48). Typos is the term invariably used in the interpretations of the School of Antioch, for its connotations were those of the koiné Greek of the New Testament. Figura (the term which Augustine normally uses), as Auerbach correctly observes, "more or less consciously evoked all the notions involved in its [classical] history" (p. 48). One of the "notions" the term evokes is Greek allegorism, and subsequently the allegory of Philo, Origen, Jerome, and Augustine.[86]

---

[85] A. D. R. Polman, _The Word of God According to St. Augustine_ (London: 1961), p. 96. For an analysis of the influence of Augustinian allegory on English poetry, see Bernard F. Huppé, _Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry_ (New York: 1959).

In one sense, Augustine's influence on his successors is vastly out of proportion to the single commentary he devotes to typology, Contra Faustum. On the other hand, his condemnation of a "blind adherence to the letter," the attendant disrepute of the Antiochene school, and his actual exegetical practice, utilizing as it does the four-fold method of interpretation, all serve to equate historical typology with the literal sense and to effectively subordinate it to allegorical readings. Further, the fact that Augustine devoted only one minor treatise to typology may explain why his more elaborate comments about allegory were influential and the Contra

---

[86] In his discussion of Augustine's principles of exegesis, for example, Auerbach cites more than twenty passages from Augustine's works where the term used is not typos but figura. More is involved in the decline of typos in favor of figura than the simple fact that one is a "foreign" term.

Faustum almost entirely neglected. Moreover, as his comments on the Exodus typology reveal, Augustine adds very little to the work of his predecessors; for as the citations in this chapter indicate, the material he utilizes was a part of the common tradition by Augustine's time:

> . . . The Red Sea . . . is Baptism hallowed by the blood of Christ, the enemies who pursued are past sins wiped away. The people were led through the desert; the baptized who as yet only enjoy heaven in hope are, as it were, in the desert. The bitter waters were sweet ones through the wood; a hardened people is melted by the sign of Christ's Cross. . . . The enemy who attempted to bar his way was overcome by the outstretched arms of Moses, a [signo] of the Lord's Cross. And the serpent-bites are healed by looking upon the brazen serpents, which is interpreted by the Lord's own words: "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so it behoved the Son of man to be lifted up."[87]

As Daniélou comments,

> St. Augustine starts with a certain number of types which the New Testament offers . . . and shows how around these primitive groups other elements have to be interpreted in the same way according to the analogy of faith (p. 201).

---

[87] Cited in Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, p. 200. I have again modified Daniélou's translation; the term Augustine uses is signo not typos: "Et hostis includere molitus viam, extensis Moysi manibus signo crucis dominicae superatur . . ." ("Contra Faustum," Patrologia Latina, Series 3, ed. J. P. Migne [Paris: 1886], XLII, 270. Daniélou's use of the terms figura and signo as synonymous with the transliterated typos reflects his thesis that the allegorical interpretations of the Fathers are legitimate and justifiable extensions of the literal meaning. As the representative citation from Chrysostom indicates (see above, n. 78), the Antiochenes do not confuse the basic differences between typos and such other terms as figura and signo.

The "analogy of faith" becomes to medieval interpreters the invitation to allegory; for most passages are not as typologically oriented as the Exodus account and "other elements" in other passages, and even in explicit typological passages, will become more numerous as the centuries pass by.

The major outlines of typology as a method of biblical exegesis and as an aspect of biblical imagery, then, are established by the middle of the fifth century. Changes will be made, of course, for such commentators as St. Bonaventura develop a system involving eight levels of interpretation. Typological imagery,as I demonstrate in the next chapter, will also change; for one aspect of the *renaissance* of humanistic learning is the amalgamation of biblical and mythological images, such as the Hercules-Samson figure. But the underlying assumptions which inform the writings of Origen, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine --and New England Puritanism--will remain the same until the mid-eighteenth century, when a more rationalistic temper will contribute to the development of "modern," historical biblical criticism. For commentators as different as Irenaeus and Increase Mather, as different as Justin Martyr and Jonathan Edwards, still share four fundamental convictions concerning the nature of the Holy Scriptures. First, the belief in the absolute verbal or plenary inspiration of the scriptural text is the starting point of biblical exegesis for seventeen centuries. Second, and closely related to verbal inspiration, is the conviction that the New Covenant did not abrogate the Old Covenant; commentators will disagree on the exact nature of the relationship between the two testaments, but they will all agree that the Bible incorporates both. In addition, the assumption that both testaments are a part of the Christian heritage involves a third conviction: all books of scripture are of equal value. The concept of "progressive revelation" does not affect exegesis in any significant way until the eighteenth century. And, finally, Patristic and Puritan commentator alike insist that the convictions, attitudes, and discoveries of the secular world must be reconciled to Revealed Truth as it is found in God's Word. No Puritan was unaware of the context of fledgling Harvard's motto: "*Veritas*." The Truth was in Christ and the men who prefigured Him. These assumptions were almost universally accepted in Western thought from the beginning of the Christian era; in them lie the seeds of the downfall of the Puritan theocracy.

CHAPTER II

TYPOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND RENAISSANCE

Although the use of the typological construct by New Testament authors is relatively minor, even in the canonical books the emphasis on typology as a method of exegesis varies from author to author. St. Paul's primary concern in the epistles is to establish a structure of belief which will enable the early Christians to discover their identity as members of a unique faith. In this creation of a "theology," typical relationships are only incidental to Paul's major concern: the problem of defining the Christian faith itself is more central to his purposes than defining its relationship to Judaism. As has been discussed in Chapter I, however, both Matthew and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews allot to typology a much more important role. Matthew explicitly relates Christ's life and work to the messianic traditions of Judaism; text by text he reveals that Christ's actions were expressly prefigured in the prophetic utterances and historical experiences of the Jews. The view of the author of Hebrews is even more comprehensive: the entire Old Testament is one grand "scheme of typical provisions" which find their fulfillment in the antitypical person of

Christ.[1] Hence, from the beginning the identification of the type-antitype depended in part upon an author's individualistic approach to the Hebrew Scriptures and upon his specific purpose in writing. Such variety in approach became a central characteristic of the commentaries of the Greek Fathers; each succeeding age developed its own problems and demanded--and received--its own revelation. And even when orthodoxy codified the general framework of dogma and the slowly evolving four-fold sense of interpretation became the dominant hermeneutical approach, typology, as a subcategory of allegory generally, still lent itself, in spite of the corpus of Church Tradition, to highly individualistic interpretations.

Moreover, typology, in a broad sense, is by no means a specifically theological concern. Types have an imagistic quality about them which permits the type-antitype construct to be easily assimilated into various art forms. Such terms as _eikon_ (image), _typos_ (Latin _typus_), _figura_, _schema_, _signo_, and _paradeigma_ (pattern) all have strong visual connotations, enabling the early Fathers to incorporate types as "pictures" of Christ in sermons and homilies, thereby providing Christian artists with a large body of images which, by the simplest lines, could be made to evoke centuries of biblical traditions.[2] Moreover, because of its relation to allegorical exegesis, typology readily entered into the secular literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. As D. W. Robertson notes, "literary allegory, although it remained a distinct entity, became closely associated with the allegorical exposition of the Scriptures"; hence, typology is unobtrusively present in the works of such disparate writers as Chaucer, Spenser, Donne, and, of course, Milton.[3] This broader, non-theological aspect of typology, Gerhard von Rad asserts,

---

[1] Brooke Foss Westcott, "Introduction," _The Epistle to the Hebrews_ (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1965), p. liii. Westcott also notes that The Gospel of Matthew and The Epistle to the Hebrews are two of the three New Testament books expressly addressed to Jews, the Epistle of St. James being the third (p. li).

---

[2] For Chrysostom's comparison of typology with painting, see Chap. I, pp. 121ff. For a discussion of the visual aspects of allegory generally, see Angus Fletcher, _Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode_ (Ithaca, New York: 1964), pp. 179ff.

[3] D. W. Robertson, Jr., "Allegory, Humanism, Literary Theory," _A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives_ (Princeton: 1963), p. 289. Although typology is rarely discussed as distinct from allegory, a number of literary critics have briefly commented on its importance in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. See, for example, Harry Caplan, "The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching," _Speculum_ (July, 1929), IV, 282-290; and Rosemary Woolf, "The Effect of Typology on the English Mediaeval Plays of Abraham and Isaac," _Speculum_ (October, 1957), XXXII, 805-825. For Spenser's use of typology, see Edwin Greenlaw, _Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory_ (Baltimore: 1932), and Rosemond Tuve, _Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and Their Posterity_ (Princeton: 1966). Donne's use of typology is analyzed in Dennis B. Quinn, "John Donne's Principles of Biblical Exegesis," _Journal of English and Germanic Philology_ (April, 1962), LXI, 313-329; and in William R. Mueller, _John Donne: Preacher_ (Princeton: 1962), especially Chap. II, "Golden Chrysostome . . . Alive

> . . . is an elementary function of all human thought and interpretation. It is, for example, employed in a certain respect in our proverbs, which continually relate a not immediately controllable multiplicity of things to something relatively or absolutely normative, and thus enable us to discern the order that is nevertheless immanent in them. And, above all, without this interpretive, analogical sort of thinking there would be no poetry. The poet goes ceaselessly to and fro; he sees the often insignificant, obvious things and recognizes in them ultimate value.

In phrases which could easily be mistaken for Emerson, von Rad concludes:

> In the movement of the elements, the passing of the years and the days, in the most elementary relationships of man with man, in simple mechanical performances--in everything regularity "reveals" itself, and hints at an order that dwells deep within things, in which the smallest as well as the greatest things participate.[4]

This chapter makes no pretense of being a comprehensive survey of the extensive use of typology in the art and

---

Again." Milton's somewhat more comprehensive use of types is discussed in Northrop Frye, "The Typology of *Paradise Regained*," *Modern Philology* (May, 1956), LIII, 227-238; William G. Madsen, "Earth the Shadow of Heaven: Typological Symbolism in *Paradise Lost*," *PMLA* (December, 1960), LXXV, 519-556; and F. Michael Krouse, *Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition* (Princeton: 1949). For an analysis of the relationship of typology to allegorical personification, see Samuel C. Chew, *The Virtues Reconciled: An Iconographic Study* (Toronto: 1947).

[4] Gerhard von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, ed. Claus Westermann (Richmond, Virginia: 1963), p. 17.

literature of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance; such an investigation is outside the scope of this study. The purpose of this chapter is, however, to illustrate how typology pervades Medieval and Renaissance life and thought, continuing to inform the writings of the Latin Fathers, being reflected in various art forms, and, finally, appearing in such illustrated works as the Biblia Pauperum and the closely related emblem books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Generally speaking, the exegetical principles which St. Augustine acquired from Origen and Jerome remained, with only minor modifications, the orthodox Catholic approach to the Scriptures until the Reformation; the role of typology as a sub-category of the allegorical level also remained essentially the same. It would be incorrect, of course, to assert that medieval exegetes did not attempt certain modifications of the four-fold approach. Hugh of St. Victor, to take a single instance, and the members of the Victorine school who followed him, expressed strong reservations about allegorical interpretations, attempting as an antidote to reestablish the primacy of the literal sense.[5] In like manner, typological interpretations did not remain static; such men as Bede, Gregory the First, John of Damascus, Anselm, Theophylact, Abelard, St. Bernard, and Peter Lombard modified and embellished the traditional typological interpretations of Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. But in the essential framework of the four-fold sense of exegesis and in the subordination of typology to allegory there were no major changes before the Protestant Reformation. Details changed; principles, however, remained the same.

---

[5] For a discussion of the Victorines' dissatisfaction with allegorical readings, see Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Oxford: 1952), pp. 83ff. See also below, Chap. III, pp. 234-237, for my

The two leading twelfth century Doctors of the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, are representative of the continuation of the Augustinian principles of exegesis and of the tendency to create highly individualistic interpretations of biblical events. It is a truism of biblical criticism that Aquinas is the synthesis of Augustine and Aristotle, that Bonaventure is the synthesis of Augustine and Plato.[6] From the time of Pope Sixtus V, whose encyclical places the two men side by side as the "most illustrious teachers of the Church," and Dante's union of the two in Book XII of the Paradiso, the

---

discussion of the Victorines as precursors of the Protestant insistence on the literal meaning of scripture.

[6] See, for example, Philip Schaff, The History of the Christian Church: The Middle Ages (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1957), V, 659-683; Adolph Harnack, The History of Dogma (New York: 1958), VI, 155ff.; and Anton C. Pegis, "Introduction," Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas (New York: 1945), I, xxxixff.

two men have represented the somewhat contradictory but not irreconcilable strains of medieval Scholasticism. As Philip Schaff comments:

> Thomas had the keener mind, excelling in powers of analysis. Bonaventura indulged in the habit of elaboration. The ethical element was conspicuous in Thomas, the mystical in Bonaventura. Thomas was the more authoritative teacher, Bonaventura the more versatile writer. Both were equally champions of the theology and organizations of the mediaeval Church.[7]

Aquinas' comments concerning allegorical interpretations are few and, in each case, are related to his defense, with a slight modification, of Augustine's four-fold sense of scripture. In the Summa Theologica, Aquinas answers the objection that "in Holy Scripture a word cannot have several senses, historical or literal, allegorical, tropological or moral, and anagogical" by asserting that several different senses in one text do not necessarily produce confusion and contradictions. Aquinas slightly rearranges Augustine's four-fold sense by asserting that there are in fact only two senses, the literal and the spiritual, but that the spiritual sense has a three-fold division: allegorical, moral, and anagogical:

> The author of Holy Scripture is God, in Whose power it is to signify His meaning, not by words only (as man also can do) but by things themselves. . . . Therefore that first signification whereby

---

[7] The History of the Christian Church, V, 680.

> things signified by words have themselves also a signification is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal, and presupposes it. Now this spiritual sense has a three-fold division. For as the Apostle says (Heb. x. I) the Old Law is a figure [figura] of the New Law. . . . Therefore, so far as the things of the Old Law signify the things of the New Law, there is the allegorical sense; so far as the things done in Christ, or so far as the things which signify Christ, are signs of what we ought to do, there is the moral sense. But so far as they signify what relates to eternal glory, there is the anagogical sense.[8]

The change in terminology does not modify Augustine's division; Aquinas essentially restates the principles of exegesis which had been established for eight centuries. Moreover, as his comments make clear, Aquinas makes no distinction between typology and allegory: ". . . so far as the things of the Old Law signify the things of the New Law, there is the allegorical sense." Aquinas illustrates the different senses as follows:

> Holy Scripture speaks of four marriages. The first in its historical and literal sense, the bodily union of a man and woman; the second allegorical, the union of Christ with his Church; the third tropological or moral, the union of God with the soul; the fourth anagogical or eschatological, the union of God with the Church Triumphant.[9]

---

[8] St. Thomas Aquinas, "The Summa Theologica," Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas (New York: 1945), I, 16-17.

[9] "Sunday Sermons, 20," St. Thomas Aquinas: Theological Texts, ed. Thomas Gilby (Oxford: 1955), p. 20.

The terms type and antitype, even in their Latin cognates, do not occur in his discussions of the various senses. Although he cites continually from Augustine, Aquinas makes no reference to the *Contra Faustum* or to any of Augustine's typological interpretations. The same is true of the citations from Origen, Jerome, Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers. Although Aquinas knew no Hebrew and very little Greek, one would suppose that in his writings references to typology would appear, for many of the Patristic commentators whom he cites, particularly Chrysostom for example, extensively utilize typological terminology. It appears, however, that in the thought of Aquinas typology has been discarded or has been so completely absorbed in the allegorical sense that it has ceased to exist as a separate method of exegesis.

Quite the opposite is true, however, in the work of Bonaventure. Although his exegetical principles are generally the same as those of Aquinas, the mystical bent of his nature leads him to focus more upon the "illuminative" aspect of scripture:

> . . . Holy Scripture possesses a depth which consists in the multiplicity of the mystical intelligences. Besides a literal sense, it possesses diverse places capable of triple construction, namely, allegorical, moral, and anagogical.[10]

---

[10] "The Depth of Holy Scripture," *Breviloquim*, ed. Erwin Esser Nemmers (St. Louis: 1947), p. 12.

Bonaventure's terminology differs slightly from that of Augustine and Aquinas; he acknowledges the literal sense, but the "spiritual" sense of Aquinas becomes "a multiplicity of the mystical intelligences." Further, in his interpretation of the anagogical sense, he focuses less on eschatology and more on mystic illumination, "the eternal happiness of the saints." Occasionally Bonaventure introduces a seven-fold sense of scripture; to the traditional four-fold sense, he adds the symbolic, the synekdochic, and the hyperbolic.[11] In one sense, Bonaventure's allegorical interpretations are a continuation of the methods of the Alexandrian school of exegesis;[12] on the other hand, the "Prince of Mystics" often discards the traditional allegorical rendering of certain passages, substituting instead a quite nontraditional approach which is best described as mystical. And in some cases, Bonaventure utilizes early typical identifications, quite apart from allegory, as the basis for his interpretation. In

---

[11] Frederic W. Farrar, History of Interpretation (New York: 1886), p. 273. See also J. Guy Bougerol, Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure, trans. José de Vinck (Patterson, N. J.: 1964), especially Chap. III, "Doctor Scripturae Evangelicae"; and the seven-fold interpretation of Christ's statement, "I am the true vine," in The Mystical Vine: A Treatise on the Passion of Our Lord, trans. A Friar of S. S. F. (London: 1955).

[12] George Boas, "Introduction," Saint Bonaventura: The Mind's Road to God (New York: 1953), pp. xivff.

Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum, for example, Bonaventure uses the Exodus journey through the wilderness as the basic metaphor for the stages of mystical illumination, "the mind's road to God." As early as Didymus and Ambrose, the Exodus passage had been allegorically interpreted as the journey of the soul to God; for them, and Augustine as well, however, the allegory represented the different stages of man's spiritual life--deliverance from sin (the Egyptians) by baptism (the crossing of the Red Sea), exposure to temptation in the wilderness of life, and, ultimately, the "vision" of God on the mountain through death and resurrection. For Bonaventure, the process is not an allegory of man's life, but of the immediate and present apprehension of the beatitude of God.

The typological aspect of the Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum has not been noted before. The traditional position of biblical scholars is that the work simply describes the soul's ascent, through each stage of illumination, "toward a mystic vision of God."[13] In analyzing the meditative traditions of seventeenth century poetry, Louis L. Martz reflects this view of the Itinerarium: ". . . the intense exercise of self-analysis to purge the soul, and . . .

---

[13] Boas, The Mind's Road to God, p. xxi.

make way for the 'presence of God.'"[14] Although the typical incidents of the Exodus passage do not dominate the work, if one recognizes their place in the general framework of the mystical process, the Itinerarium becomes something more than a mystical treatise. The work has its origin in a vision which Bonaventure had on Mount Alverna, the same mountain where St. Francis had beheld the "winged Seraph in the likeness of the Crucified."[15] The six-winged seraph signifies the "six stages of illumination by which the soul . . . pass[es] into peace by ecstatic elevations of Christian wisdom." The title of the first section establishes the dominant metaphor: "The Mendicant's Vision in the Wilderness." Through prayer, Bonaventure says, one may come to know the stages in the ascension to God, the "three days' journey into the wilderness." And in the same context, he makes it clear that to ascend to God, it is necessary to be "true Hebrews crossing from Egypt to the land promised to our fathers . . ." (p. 10). Throughout the treatise, references are made to the Exodus experiences, establishing a typological framework for the mysticism of illumination. Finally, to describe the beatific state of the vision of God, Bonaventure asserts that the pilgrim makes a "passover,"

---

[14] Louis L. Martz, The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century (New Haven: 1954), p. 150.

[15] Boas, The Mind's Road to God, p. 4. All citations refer to this edition.

> . . . over the Red Sea by the staff of the cross from Egypt into the Desert, where he may taste the hidden manna and with Christ may rest in the tomb as if outwardly dead, yet knowing, as far as possible in our earthly condition, what was said on the cross to the thief cleaving to Christ: "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (p. 44).

The usual types are included in this passage: Moses' staff held out over the Sea is a type of the Cross; the Red Sea is a type of baptism; the manna is a type of the Eucharist; the journey ends in the blinding vision of Mt. Sinai. And in many ways the passage is traditional; the same typical identifications appear in numerous Patristic commentaries. On the other hand, for Bonaventure, the "hidden" manna is the mystical vision, the pilgrim "is laid asleep in body" and shares, as far as possible, the vision of Paradise.[16]

---

[16] It is clear from Bonaventure's use of the Exodus account that he sees the wilderness experiences as a central metaphor for the Quest, a pilgrimage which leads to an apprehension of the Heavenly. Because the allegorical interpretations of the Greek and Latin Fathers became so much a part of the literary allegory of the secular literature of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance, one wonders if the Exodus journey is not more widely influential than literary critics have noted. Northrop Frye, for example, asserts that "the absence of any genuinely literary criticism of the Bible . . . has left an enormous gap in our knowledge of literary symbolism as a whole. [Such criticism] . . . would see the Bible, not as a scrapbook of corruptions, glosses, redactions . . . , but as the typological unity which all these things were originally intended to help construct. . . . Once our view of the

Apart from such individualistic interpretations as Bonaventure's, there are relatively few changes in typological analyses; Augustine's four-fold sense and his subordination of typology to allegory dominate the works of the Latin Fathers. Such is not the case, however, in the relation of types to various art forms, for the type-antitype constructs are found in mosaics, stained glass windows, sculptures, elaborately jeweled crosses, medallions, enameled screens, vestments, illuminated manuscripts, funerary ornamentation, reliefs, frescoes, and, in the sixteenth century, even in elaborately constructed clocks. Moreover, in the arts, in addition to the body of traditional identifications, artists introduced literally hundreds of new typical parallels. In an early thirteenth century treatise, Pictor in Carmine, a collection of types and antitypes designed for use by artists, the unknown author presents a list of Old Testament types which parallel 138 New Testament subjects; 508 typical identifications

---

Bible comes into proper focus, a great mass of literary symbols from The Dream of the Rood to Little Gidding begins to take on meaning." And Frye cites as an example the "heroic quest of the central figure called the Messiah, who is associated with various royal figures in the Old Testament and identified with Christ in the New" (Anatomy of Criticism [Princeton: 1957], pp. 315-316). Frye discusses the Quest under the "mythos of romance"; in less general terms, however, it is possible that the specific Old Testament account of the Exodus is the primary, nonmythic source for such works as Sir Gawain and the Green Knight and The Fairie Queene.

are enumerated.[17] In many cases, as the list and as practice illustrate, an artist will entirely recast the biblical material, subordinating traditional types to his own individualistic view of artistic proportion.

Typology as a method of exegesis began by identifying certain Old Testament personages and events as prefigurations of Christ; typology in the arts, as Erwin R. Goodenough has conclusively demonstrated, began in the same way, for an analysis of "early Christian paintings shows that Christian art began with a number of types from the Old Testament. . . ."[18] In spite of the express prohibition against "graven images" in the Second Commandment, Goodenough has shown that as early as the second century B. C., Jewish artists began decorating walls of the synagogues with mosaics and paintings representing the major historical experiences of Judaism; predominant among the figures and scenes represented were Noah, Abraham, numerous scenes from the life of Moses (particularly the crossing of the Red Sea, the miraculous appearance of manna, the reception of the law on Sinai, and the image of the brazen serpent), Joshua, David, Solomon, and the later prophets. One of the dominant concerns of early artists is the messianic theme, which, as has been discussed in Chapter I, was interpreted typologically as early as the Gospel of Matthew. In summarizing the thematic significance of the paintings and mosaics of the Dura synagogue, for example, Rachel Wischnitzer concludes that the "messianic concept which pervades the rabbinical literature . . . has been found to be the organizing, formative factor in the iconography of the synagogue decoration."[19] Early Christian artists simply adapted certain traditional themes in Jewish art to the Christian interpretation of these events by adding antitypical incidents from the Gospels. In fact, as early as the third and fourth centuries, in mosaic art and in paintings a symbolic cycle of types and antitypes developed which can be traced, with only slight modifications, from mosaics of the fourth century churches to the stained glass windows and sculptured figures in the major cathedrals constructed on the continent and in England during the Middle Ages.

---

[17] Montague R. James, "Pictor in Carmine," Archaeologia (1951), XCIV, 141-166.

[18] Erwin R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (New York: 1953), I, 24. Goodenough's massive twelve-volume study is the definitive work in this area; for the relationship of early Christian symbolism to Jewish art, I am heavily indebted to his work. For a briefer discussion of the relation of Jewish art to pagan myth, see his Religious Tradition and Myth (New Haven: 1937).

---

[19] Rachel Wischnitzer, The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue (Chicago: 1948), p. 100. Wischnitzer also notes that the impetus for the popularity of the messianic theme in painting can be traced in general terms to Philo's allegorical interpretations of Hebrew Scripture. The same is true, of course, in relation to typological exegesis.

In their discussion of the mosaics of the St. Maria Maggiore Chapel in Rome, for example, Jean Paul Richter and A. Cameron Taylor have shown that the drawings which decorate the nave are based upon four typological series: Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and Joshua. These figures, and incidents relating to their lives, form small units with three or more scenes depicting major events in the lives of each one of the central figures. In the group devoted to Moses, all fourteen scenes presented--Moses discovered by Pharoah's daughter, the incident of the burning bush, the crossing of the Red Sea, the reception of the Law on Mt. Sinai, and so on--have typological significance. In the mosaics of the arch, constructed about 100 years later, the antitypes are created, with only minor differences, to parallel the typological series of the nave. Moses was one of the first Old Testament figures identified as a type of Christ, and the antitypical scenes in the arch present the corresponding incidents in the life of Christ which have been prefigured in the typical Mosaic decorations of the nave: the baby in the bullrushes discovered by the Pharoah's daughter prefigures the child in the manger worshipped by the Magi; the burning bush prefigures the Holy Virgin consumed by the fire of the Holy Spirit;

the crossing of the Red Sea prefigures Christ's baptism; the reception of the Law on Sinai parallels the giving of the new Law in the Sermon on the Mount, and so on.[20] By studying the writings of the Church Fathers, Richter and Cameron have been able to demonstrate that the types of the nave are based upon the writings of Justin Martyr (second century) while the minor variations of the antitypes of the arch are found in the allegories of Origen. They point out that the selection of non-biblical works "as the basis of these church decorations is symptomatic of the desire to embody some tendency to which the canonical writings did not lend themselves."[21] The authors relate the antitypical decorations of the arch to the allegorical interpretations of the Alexandrian school of exegesis, noting that "the names of those Christian thinkers whose written views unite in presenting parallels with those pictorially embodied" in the chapel are Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Origen, and Tertullian (p. 339). The same cyclic type-antitype pattern, with only slight differences, had appeared in numerous catacomb paintings of the early Christians and in the decorations of sarcophagi. Charles R. Morey suggests that the considerable increase in the third and fourth centuries of "subjects from the Old Testament is probably due at least in part to the dissemination in the Latin West of illustrated manuscripts"of the type primarily associated with the School of Alexandria.[22]

---

[20] For a discussion of the cycles in the iconographic traditions of Moses, see Louis Réau, Iconographie de l'Art Chrétien (Paris: 1956), I, especially "Moïse et l'exode d'Égypte," pp. 175ff.

[21] Jean Paul Richter and A. Cameron Taylor, The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art (London: 1904), p. 33.

Cyclic representations of the type-antitype are also found in the famous wooden doors of the Church of St. Sabina in Rome (fifth century), the mosaics of Ravenna (sixth century), in the walls of the apse of St. Apollinare in Classe (seventh century), and so on.[23] But the most complex of the Old and New Testament cyclic representations were executed in stone and in stained glass during the years St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure were the leading theologians of the Roman Church. By the twelfth century, typological cycles were a standard aspect of church decoration, and by that time cathedral designs and artistic themes were "governed by a very precise hierarchy."[24] The exterior sculpture and the stained glass windows are designed to complement each other. The motifs of Christ and Mary ordinarily occupy the central window in the chancel and the transept fronts and west wall; the link between the Old and New Testaments, as Hutter notes, is "stressed didactically by associating apostles and prophets, who can be depicted standing quite literally on each others' shoulders" (p. 9). These figures are traditionally associated with the sculptured ornamentation of the north side. The central doorway of the northern portal at Chartres, for example, illustrates the type-antitype cyclic patterns as they are reflected in religious sculpture. The tympanum, the central scene at the top center of the arch, represents the coronation of the Virgin; Christ and Mary are seated side by side on identical thrones.[25] To the left and one tier lower are statues of five Old Testament figures who, as early as Justin Martyr, were identified as types of Christ: Melchizedek, Abraham, Moses, Aaron, and David. Each figure holds symbols which emphasize his typical relationship. Melchizedek holds a loaf of bread and a chalice; in Abraham's right hand is the knife which was to be used in the sacrifice of Isaac; Moses holds the tables of the Law and a staff around which is coiled the brazen serpent; symbols of the priesthood are associated with the statue of Aaron;[26] and David carries the instruments of the Passion--in his right hand is the spear symbolizing Christ's pierced side and in the left hand a crown of thorns. The five figures who prefigure Christ dominate the left side on the door; on the right side are five comparable figures who prophesy or announce the Messiah: Melchizedek, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Simeon (the prophet present at Christ's presentation in the Temple), and John the Baptist. St. Peter stands directly opposite the Melchizedek statue in the left group, symbolizing the continuity between the Old and New Law. Typical figures and events also appear in other sculptures in the west and south portals and throughout the interior, but the cyclic representations dominate only the northern portal. Nor are the type-antitype cyclic representations limited only to stonework. In a massive enameled altar created by Nicolas of Verdun in 1181, "three super-imposed rows of scenes from the New Testament [were] matched up typologically with similar ones from the Old Testament . . .";[27] at the base of the astronomical clock of the Cathedral at Strasburg, constructed by Conrad Dasypodius in 1573, the two lower tiers present super-imposed typical and antitypical scenes, created in the same style as the figures at Chartres.[28]

---

[22] Charles R. Morey, Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century (Princeton: 1962), p. 69. Summarizing his discussion of the no longer extant parchment rolls, Morey notes that the "archetypes of the text of the Septuagint were Alexandrian, and . . . when these texts were illustrated, their miniatures were cast in 'Alexandrian' style" (p. 77).

[23] See especially Plates 141-149, Morey, Early Christian Art.

---

[24] Heribert Hutter, _Medieval Stained Glass_ (New York: 1964), p. 9.

[25] For illustrations of the northern portal, see Margaret and Ernest Marriage, _The Sculptures of Chartres Cathedral_ (Cambridge: 1909), Plates 65-91; and Jean Villette, _Chartres and its Cathedral_ (London: 1963), Plates 30-39.

---

[26] Margaret and Ernest Marriage, as Villette points out, incorrectly identify the figure of Aaron as the Samuel of the New Testament (p. 158). The rigid chronological sequence of the north portal and the priest-king theme preclude such an identification.

It is in stained glass, however, that complex typological cycles and single type-antitype constructs are most widely represented in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; some of the same sequences are also introduced in churches constructed as late as the early sixteenth century. As Paul Lacroix notes, "stained glass filled the role which, from early Christian times to the end of the Roman era, was occupied by mosaics and murals" (p. 7). The number of type-antitype identifications in cyclic representations increases; more single typological scenes are incorporated within panels representing Legends of the Saints and secular subjects; and, finally, the "Jesse Tree" (the typical representation of Christ's genealogy) becomes one of the single most popular subjects for stained glass artists. Although stained glass is mentioned in numerous writings of the eleventh century, there are no extant windows before the middle of the twelfth. The first panels which can be dated with certainty are found in the Chapel of St. Denis in Paris, arranged by Suger, the abbot, who died in 1151. The style of the glasswork and the subject matter of the windows dominate the construction of subsequent cathedrals. The iconographic program which the abbot designed was extremely complex, particularly in relation to typology:

---

[27] Hutter, p. 46.

[28] See Paul Lacroix, The Arts in the Middle Ages (New York: 1964), Fig. 152, p. 184. This brief catalogue of cyclic typical sculptured representations is by no means intended to be more than a suggestion of the widespread use in different art forms of the super-imposed pattern. Moreover, each figure in these cyclic forms contributes to further type-antitype cycles in connection with the single figure itself. In the relation of Moses to the Exodus typology alone, for example, Réau cites eighty-one works of art, ranging from the third to seventeenth centuries, including, in addition to sculptures and stained glass, frescoes, enamels, psalters, choir screens, illustrated manuscripts, baptismal fonts, tapestries, mosaics, paintings, miniatures, and decorations on sarcophagi and doors, all of which represent various aspects of the Exodus types (see I, 192-203).

> . . . Suger's richest innovation was the revival of the traditional reciprocity between the Old and New Testament (iconographically known as "typologic") so that each incident in the life of Christ is shown with its Old Testament counterpart. Moreover, he gave to this iconography a new form . . .: for example, the picture of the tree of Jesse springing from the chest of the Patriarch and bearing in its branches the Kings of Judah, the Virgin's ancestors.[29]

---

[29] Louis Grodecki, The Stained Glass of French Churches (Paris: 1948), p. 14. See also Hugh Arnold and

Apart from the introduction of the typologically represented Jesse Tree, Suger's innovation was not, as Grodecki suggests, the "revival of the traditional reciprocity between the Old and New Testament"; for such parallel arrangements were the basic framework from which Christian art began. Moreover, there are extant works of art from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries which utilize this "traditional reciprocity." Before the abbot's work, however, the typical identifications were ordinarily limited to the major incidents in the life of Christ (the birth, baptism, crucifixion, and resurrection) which were prefigured in the Old Testament. Suger's innovation was to extend the typical relationship to "each incident" in Christ's life. The exact number of typical incidents which Suger identifies is not known, for there are only a few complete extant windows, and the contemporary drawings from which the patterns have been reconstructed are fragmentary. Apparently all of these windows had captions identifying their significance; one of the small extant windows (medallions) picturing the Ark of the Covenant emphasizes the "message" in a rhymed Latin hexameter: "_Quod Moyses velat, Christi doctrina revelat_." The extant

---

Lawrence B. Saint, _Stained Glass of the Middle Ages in England and France_ (London: 1913), pp. 44ff.; and Erwin Panofsky, "Abbot Suger of St. Denis," _Meaning in the Visual Arts_ (New York: 1957), pp. 108-145.

windows at Canterbury, which are in the St. Denis style, incorporate similar rhymes.[30]

The original pattern of the typical windows at Chartres cannot be determined because only the panes in the west front survived the fire of 1194. The subjects of these panels and the principles of construction are in the St. Denis style and were undoubtedly created some time during the second half of the twelfth century.[31] The central and largest window depicts twenty-four scenes from the childhood of Christ in alternating round and square medallions; the right-hand window contains a Jesse Tree in exactly the same style as the one in St. Denis Chapel; and the window at the left consists of sixteen medallions of the Passion. The close relationship of the windows of Chartres to the program outlined by Suger suggests that the Christological theme enunciated in the west windows would have been extended according to the orthodox architectural pattern to the rest of the windows, devoting the north side and portal to super-imposed type-antitype representations. After the great fire in 1194, 173 stained glass windows were added to the cathedral, however, and no iconographic pattern seems to have prevailed in the construction and location of the glass panels. The windows of the north side of the nave are generally ordered typologically; at Chartres, however, the upper windows are filled with single figures, the "lower windows with legendary scenes taken from the Old and New Testaments."[32] But the typical theme is represented even in the windows of the south transept, where the four Evangelists are shown standing on the shoulders of the four Major Prophets, emphasizing the consummation of God's work in Christ Whose triumph is celebrated in the famous Rose window of the south side. The style of St. Denis through Chartres subsequently influenced, as Marcel Aubert notes, Bourges, Laon, Sens, Tours, and Le Mans. Even when the stylistic influence is no longer apparent in the construction of the glass, typological subjects continue to be a major aspect of the decoration. In the fifteen windows of the Sainte-Chapelle on the Ile de la Cité, for example, two-thirds of the 1,134 scenes are based on Old Testament subjects, particularly from the book of Genesis. The large panel devoted to the Jesse Tree, however, differs in its representation, presenting, in place of the typical figures and prophets of the Jesse Trees of St. Denis and Chartres, stained glass representations of the twenty-eight ancestors of Christ, from Jesse to Joseph, listed in the genealogy of Matthew.[33]

---

[30] Arnold and Saint, p. 55. The application of this kind of teaching device is, of course, represented in the typical woodcuts and alphabet rhymes of the New England Primer.

[31] Grodecki, p. 16.

---

[32] Marcel Aubert, French Cathedral Windows of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (Oxford: 1947), p. 13. See especially Plates V, X, and XIV. My analysis of the windows of Chartres and Sainte-Chapelle is based on Aubert's plates.

The style of St. Denis, particularly the series of super-imposed type-antitype cycles and the Jesse Tree, influenced not only the subsequent construction of stained glass windows on the continent, but English cathedral and chapel construction as well.[34] The typical windows of the north and south choir aisles at Canterbury are so similar to the program of St. Denis that there is no question that Abbot Suger's work influenced the windows. Like Chartres, Canterbury was almost totally destroyed by fire in 1174; unlike Chartres, however, the typical windows which were installed by the first decade of the thirteenth century at Canterbury survived until Richard Culmer, the minister placed in charge during the Commonwealth, destroyed many of them. Enough windows survived, or have been reconstructed, to warrant calling them "the most exhaustive and complete sets of types and antitypes . . . to be found in any English church. . . ."[35] In the choir aisles there was originally a series of twelve windows with medallions varying in number in each window; down the center of each, three or more incidents from the life of Christ were installed (the second window on the north side of the aisle had seven different scenes), while on both sides, types from the Old Testament were related to their New Testament counterparts. In one window, for example, the top center medallion presents the Magi following the star; on the left side Balaam, with the words of his prophecy, "there shall come a star out of Jacob," is represented. On the right side of the Magi, Isaiah is shown standing at the gate of Jerusalem pointing to a star, with the words of his prophecy inscribed in the glass: "The Gentiles shall come to Thy light, and kings to the brightness of Thy rising." In the second tier, the central panel presents the Magi before Herod; on the left the Israelites are being led out of Egypt by Moses and on the right Gentiles follow Christ toward a Christian altar, leaving a heathen idol behind. In the next group, the Magi present gifts to the Child; on one side the Queen of Sheba presents gifts to Solomon and on the other Joseph in Egypt receives his brothers' homage. As at St. Denis, each of the medallions has a Latin motto attached, explaining and reinforcing the lesson to be drawn from the pictures. In the second tier, for example, the motto is "*Stella Magos duxit et eos ab Herode reduxit*, / *Sic Satanam gentes fugiunt te Christe sequentes*." In addition to the traditional type-antitype identifications, however, the Canterbury artist introduces for typical identification eight of Christ's parables, a subject, as Arnold notes, extremely rare in medieval glass (p. 62). In the Parable of the Sower, for example, seven panels, illustrating the various steps in sowing, cultivating, and reaping the grain, line the center of the window. In the second scene, illustrating the seed being thrown into thorny ground, on the left are represented the "rich men of this world in whom the life of the seed is choked"; on the right side sit Daniel, Job, and Noah, with an inscription reading "In the good ground to each was given a triple crown."[36]

---

[33] Portions of a Jesse Tree, different from the St. Denis and Chartres examples but similar to the Sainte-Chapelle Tree, exist in fragments from the abbey church of Gercy and have been dated c. 1215, thirty years before those executed in the Sainte-Chapelle (Hutter, p. 28). The Jesse Tree was capable of almost infinite variation; Lacroix, for example, reproduces a facsimile of a medallion in a fifteenth century manuscript Breviary in which twelve figures (representing the twelve tribes of Judah), each playing a different musical instrument, praise the Virgin and Child as, at the top of the tree, God, crowned in the miter of the Pope, looks on and blesses the figures. In Wells Cathedral, a Jesse Tree of c. 1340 has only six figures, apart from Jesse at the base and the Virgin and Child at the top: three kings (David, Solomon, and Jechonias) on the left, and three prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel) on the right (G. H. Cook, The English Cathedral through the Centuries [London: 1957], p. 144). The choice of these particular figures is dictated by a traditional division of Christian history into Six Ages; Adam, Noah, and Abraham represent the three ages before God again established a royal line. David, Solomon and Jechonias represent the royal line of the last of the Six Ages of the World, culminating in Christ the King of all ages. The same sense of chronology determines the selection of the three prophets represented in this particular Tree. For an excellent discussion of the early development of the representations of the Jesse Tree, see Arthur Watson, The Early Iconography of the Tree of Jesse (London: 1934).

---

[34] For a discussion of the extent of French influence on English stained glasswork, see Bernard Rackham, "The Question of French Influence," The Ancient Glass of Canterbury Cathedral (London: 1949), pp. 18ff. Rackham suggests that "the idiom of Canterbury may be English, but the language is French" (p. 19). The typical cycles of the choir aisle and the fragments of the Jesse tree are in the St. Denis style, suggesting if not a common school of craftsmen, then at least a common source. The Jesse Tree at York Minster is identical to the Jesse of St. Denis; Rackham notes that there is "no uncertainty about its paternity . . ." (p. 19).

[35] Montague R. James, cited in Rackham, p. 51.

The east window of the corona at Canterbury, however, is even more complex, for it is designed to summarize and carry to a theological conclusion the typical incidents represented in the aisles of the choir. Following a traditional theme in cathedral construction, the east windows are confined to the death, resurrection, and final glorification of Christ. Rackham suggests that these windows are somewhat later than those of the choir aisle and are clearly designed as the culmination of the type-antitype themes in the stained glass throughout the cathedral (p. 73). The panel is perhaps the most thematically complex of any stained glass representation, and it illustrates the extent to which allegorical typology dominated the religious mind of the late Middle Ages. There are twenty-five separate scenes in the unit; the sequence of subjects is from the bottom of the window upwards to its arched top. Three large scenes from the New Testament, the Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Glorification, dominate the center of the window; surrounding each large scene are four types of the aspect of Christ's Passion celebrated in the central image. Between the three major units, however, there are two "transitional" panels, a smaller central one surrounded by four more typical representations. The first major antitypical pattern at the bottom of the window is a scene of the Crucifixion; surrounding it are four types with Latin inscriptions identifying each type. To the left of the Crucifixion, for example, is a medallion of Moses striking the rock in the desert; the inscription reads: "Just as this stone suffers the drawing [of water] so the side of this other is riven: / water is for the carnal, but blood for the spiritual." Above the Crucifixion is a medallion of Abraham preparing to sacrifice Isaac; to the right is a panel depicting the Passover celebration; and at the bottom is an image of the two spies returning from the Promised Land with a cluster of grapes suspended on a staff between them. The first transitional panel directly above the Crucifixion group represents Christ's entombment; surrounding it are images of Joseph in the pit, Samson asleep with Delilah, Jonah cast into the sea, and Daniel in Babylon. The second major panel in the vertical center of the window shows Christ standing between two angels, preparing to step out of the tomb; around it are typical representations of Noah coming out of the ark, Jonah stepping on to shore from the whale's mouth, Rahab and the spies, and Moses and the burning bush. The second transitional group represents the Ascension. The Apostles stand in a group looking up at the disappearing figure of Christ; around this central panel are representations of the Jewish High Priest entering the Holy of Holies, the ascension of Elijah, Isaiah standing by the sickbed of King Hezekiah (Isaiah 37-39), and the translation of Enoch. At the summit of the window, Christ sits on a rainbow (Revelations 4: 3) enthroned in majesty; one of the surrounding panels depicts the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the other three represent Moses consecrating Aaron to the priesthood, Moses as a judge, and Moses receiving the Tables of the Law. The inscription for the top unit makes clear that the old Law has been superseded by the New Covenant: "In darkening cloud and flashing fire the law is the spirit. / This law is one that conceals; here a law is given that reveals what is hidden." There are numerous examples in other cathedrals which incorporate many of the same types represented in the Canterbury window;[37] none, however, is as fully representative of the spell which typology in stained glass cast over the Middle Ages.

---

[36] My discussion of these windows is based on the plates and text presented in Rackham, pp. 51-65, and Arnold, pp. 61ff.

Apart from their theological complexity, however, the typical windows at Canterbury are important in the history of medieval typology, for it is in these windows that one can see how the artist's design and sense of proportion have begun to subordinate the original purpose of stained glass to artistic considerations. Abbot Suger viewed stained glass primarily as a means of educating the ignorant, directing the viewer's thoughts "by material means toward that which is immaterial."[38] In such a window as the corona at Canterbury, the large space (twenty-three feet by seven), the sense--and necessity--of artistic proportion (centering as the window does on three major aspects of Christ's Passion), and the selection of a typical theme to complement the central images, create without question a work of art of the highest order. One feels, however, that in the construction of the window, artistic considerations (four typical medallions surrounding each central antitypical image, for example) partially determine the type-antitype identifications. There is, for example, something slightly incongruous in selecting Samson asleep with Delilah as a type of Christ's entombment. Kenneth Harrison suggests that in the effort "to find edifying parallels between the Old Testament and the New . . . the line between enthusiasm and absurdity, always narrow, was soon obliterated. . . ."[39] One cannot be certain whether the ingenuity displayed in identifying typical parallels is a result of suggestions of members of the religious order, or whether the artist in conceiving his scheme supplied the original impetus for creating typical scenes to match the design. In either case, the result is the same: typology in stained glass, as in Patristic commentaries, tends to become another aspect of the universal appeal of medieval allegory. It is for this reason, of course, that "Blue Dick" (Richard Culmer), Puritan, smashed many of the

---

[37] Rackham lists windows in twelve cathedrals and parish churches in England and on the continent which show a general similarity with the subject matter of the Canterbury window: Chartres, Le Mans, Bourges, Arles, Ely Cathedral, Water Stratford Church, Buckinghamshire, Little Barrington Church, Gloucestershire, Anzy-le-Duc on the Loire, New Minster of Winchester, Westwell Church, Ashford, Le Champ, and Poitiers Cathedral. Moreover, these examples do not represent single panes which are related, but complete panels which are organized around the same subjects as the Canterbury window.

[38] Cited in Aubert, p. 9.

---

[39] Kenneth Harrison, The Windows of King's College Chapel, Cambridge: Notes on their History and Design (Cambridge: 1952), p. 61.

Canterbury windows. It may be difficult to sympathize with such actions; it is, however, understandable. The window in the north aisle at Canterbury which presents the Parable of the Good Samaritan, for example, was not meant to be interpreted as an act of Christian charity. To the mind of the medieval religious, the parable was an allegory of the Adamaic theme: the "man who went down from Jerusalem" (the City of God), was Adam leaving Paradise; the thieves were the seven deadly sins, the Priest and Levite the Law of Moses, and the Good Samaritan was Christ Himself. Allegorical readings of this kind were no doubt partially intelligible to the parishioners, most of whom were illiterate; the Latin inscriptions identifying the allegorical significance of the scene were no doubt explained by the priests, and the windows continued to function in one sense as teaching devices. From the standpoint of the history of typology, however, the typical identifications at Canterbury, and at St. Denis and Chartres as well, are, at times, indistinguishable from Patristic allegory. Moreover, in the allegorical interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan, typology is, of course, irrelevant; for an identification of the type-antitype necessitates a basis in the Old Testament, as well as a New Testament counterpart.

In the main, however, the typical identifications at Canterbury are traditional; the trend toward allegory and the subordination of typical identifications to artistic necessities is relatively unobtrusive. On the other hand, such is not the case in the windows of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, constructed between 1515 and 1517. Of the more than one hundred windows, eighty-six are based upon typical identifications. Many of the windows display traditional type-antitype scenes and the general sense of the typical cycles is one of balance and proportion. Yet, in too many cases it is obvious that the cyclic design has necessitated the identification of an Old Testament incident on the basis of the most artificial relationship. To identify a type to parallel the antitypical scene of Christ's "Presentation in the Temple," for example, the artist selects a single verse in Isaiah as the basis for the prefiguration of the New Testament incident: "Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt: and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence . . ." (19: 1). Many of the windows are excellent examples of stained glass art; from the standpoint of typology, however, the result is poorly concealed artifice.[40]

---

[40] For a list of the subjects of the windows in King's College, see Harrison, pp. 81-82. To describe

At about the same time that the typical cycles were executed in the stained glass windows of Canterbury, the anonymous author of Pictor in Carmine expressed dissatisfaction with the "sports of fantasy" which painters had introduced in religious paintings and stained glass. His purpose, as the preface makes clear, is to compile an acceptable list of types and antitypes designed "to curb the license of painters" and "to influence their work in churches where paintings are permitted."[41] The author does not object to religious ornamentation, for "the stones may cry out, and a painted wall declare the wonderful works of God after a fashion"; he also recognizes that "comely decoration [has] already begun in many churches." In order

---

these scenes as based on artificial correspondences is not to make a value judgment or to imply that the Puritans' practice in many cases is any less artificial. Samuel Mather's explanation of the antitypical significance of the silver trumpets used in Hebrew sacrifices is no less ingenious: ". . . As the making of the silver trumpets, the ceremonial use of them, and particularly their being blown by the priests, was by immediate ordination of God, there is no doubt they had a typical sense, a Gospel signification. . . . The sound of the Gospel is compared to a 'Joyful noise. . . .' The ministers of God are 'to lift up their voices like a trumpet' to convince the people of their sins. . . . God says to his ministers, 'Set the trumpet to thy mouth. . . .' The sounding of the silver trumpets was in many particulars emblematic of the proclamation of truth" (The Figures or Types of the Old Testament [London: 1705], pp. 338-339).

[41] James, pp. 141-142. All citations refer to James's study.

to "curb the faults of excessive levity," however, the author is "compelled" to present a list of types and antitypes of a "more excellent quality" (p. 142). "Nothing seems to be admitted by the writer," James suggests, "for which he did not consider that he had scriptural warrant"; like Augustine's "analogy of faith," scriptural warrant in the Middle Ages--and the Protestant Reformation--inevitably involves the subjective reactions to scripture of each interpreter. The "restrained" approach of the author of Pictor results in 646 identifications.[42] The uncertain date of Pictor (early twelfth century) makes it impossible to determine whether the list in Pictor influenced the stained glass work in Canterbury, or whether the panels there were part of the "comely decoration already begun in many churches." The significance of Pictor, however, is that even in the early part of the twelfth century a reaction against over-ingenious typical identifications was already beginning; for the primary purpose of the author is to limit type-antitype identifications to explicit biblical authority. In one sense, however, the reaction is eight centuries too late: Alexandrian allegory is so firmly embedded in the medieval mind and the corpus of

---

[42] James also notes that "Origen was primarily responsible for that allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament upon which the whole of this book [Pictor] depends" (p. 147).

Church Tradition that neither theologians nor artists can "curb the faults of excessive levity." The paradox is, of course, that medieval orthodoxy bases its authority upon the Scriptures *and* Tradition; one major aspect of Tradition is Alexandrian allegory which, by its very nature, invites individualistic interpretations of scripture. In the fourth century, St. Hilory warned that "the best reader is he who looks for the meaning of the words in themselves . . . and who does not insist that the words signify what he presupposed before reading them." St. Chrysostom insisted that types are to be found in the Old Testament, not by taking incidents from the New Testament and then searching for their prefiguration in the Old.[43] Moreover, Puritan typologists will sound exactly like their Roman Catholic predecessors; they too will futilely attempt to establish a list of types for which there is express scriptural warrant.

There are, however, numerous illustrated works written in the thirteenth century which were so widely known that typical representations in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries became fairly standardized, although never so completely that new typical identifications ceased to be introduced.[44] Numerous Horae (primers), illustrated biblical manuscripts, breviaries, psalters, and such "abridged" illustrated collections as the Biblia Pauperum, Speculum Humanae Salvationis, and the Speculum Sanctae Mariae Virginis were so widely circulated and reprinted so many times that their influence can hardly be over-estimated.[45] The earliest and most influential of these works was the "Poor Man's Bible," in which "the [typical] scheme of Old and New Testament subjects was codified. . . ."[46] St. Ansgar, a monk of the ninth century in the monastery of Corbey in Germany, is generally believed to have compiled the Biblia Pauperum; the first extant versions of the manuscript, however, belong to the late eleventh century and it was apparently not widely circulated until the first half of the thirteenth century.[47] The text consists of passages in prose and verse, with quotations from the Old Testament relating to the types and antitypes presented in the three-paneled representations ("triptych"). As in the windows at Canterbury, the antitypical scene is presented in the central panel; on each side is a typical scene from the Old Testament; above and below the central scene, Old Testament figures related to the antitypical panel are framed in arches. Captions (rhymed Latin hexameters) identifying the significance of each part of the triptych are inscribed above

---

[43] St. Hilory's comments are found in *The Trinity*, trans. S. McKenna (New York: 1954), pp. 18ff.; St. Chrysostom's remarks are cited in Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (Westminster, Maryland: 1960), pp. 191ff.

---

[44] The major focus of this chapter is upon graphic and plastic arts; at least in one case, however, typology plays a part in musical compositions. During the twelfth century, liturgical chants were composed according to rigidly enforced regulations. Because secular Italian composers had recently introduced the chromatic scale into their compositions, Church authorities decreed that all chants would continue to be composed according to the diatonic scale. In secret, however, a number of Dutch composers created an esoteric scheme by which chromaticism could be introduced into the liturgy without the knowledge of the religious hierarchy. Ordinarily, at the fifth bar in the chant, complex clues were given, known only to the initiated, which would change the remainder of the chant to the chromatic scale. For a reason not apparent, the works so modified were associated with the liturgical chants related to the Passion, chants which involved, as in the case of stained glass windows, typical relationships. For a complete, though rather technical analysis of the major composers involved, see Edward Elias Lowinsky, The Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet (New York: 1946).

[45] For a discussion of the relation of such works, particularly the Biblia Pauperum and the Speculum Humanae Salvationis, to sixteenth and seventeenth century thought generally and in relation to George Herbert's poetry specifically, see Rosemond Tuve, A Reading of George Herbert (Chicago: 1952). Tuve provides plates of representative examples of these works, particularly those which illustrate the typological aspects of Herbert's poetry. Her note on the accessibility of these materials to sixteenth

---

and seventeenth century readers (pp. 204-210) clearly demonstrates the widespread use and knowledge of such material.

[46] Rackham, p. 52.

[47] For a discussion of the textual problems related to the Biblia Pauperum, see Adolphe Napoleon Didron, Christian Iconography: The History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages, 2nd ed. (New York: 1965), II, 202ff. For representative plates of the various extant copies of the Biblia, see Henrik Cornell, Biblia Pauperum (Stockholm: 1925).

and below, and the Old Testament passages which prefigure the New Testament incident are inscribed in the upper left and right hand corners. In the triptych which presents John baptizing Christ, for example, the central part of the panel presents the scene at the river Jordan. John stands on one side, pouring water from a chalice upon Christ's head; an angel views the scene from the left side of the river; and above, a dove descends from heaven. The caption reads: "While he is baptizing, Christ sanctifies baptism."[48] To the left of the Jordan scene is a panel depicting the crossing of the Red Sea ("Their foes are drowned; they walk through the path of the sea"); to the right, the two Hebrew spies, with a huge cluster of grapes suspended on a staff between them, cross the Jordan River ("The river is crossed, and the land of honey reached"). In the upper left hand corner, the compiler explains the significance of the Exodus scene presented directly below, and identifies the relationship of the Red Sea crossing to Christ's baptism:

> We read in the fourteenth chapter of Exodus (v. 23), that Pharaoh, when he was pursuing the children of Israel with chariots and horsemen, entered the Red Sea after the children of Israel, and the Lord closed the waters upon them, and

---

[48] My analysis of the Biblia is based upon a translation of the Latin text presented in Didron, II, 403-430; for the woodcuts, I have used Biblia pauperum, ed. H. Th. Musper (Munich: 1961). All page references refer to these texts.

> thus liberated his people from the hand of those who were following. Likewise, through the water of baptism, sanctified by Christ, He has freed Christian men from sin (p. 408).

Passages from the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel are quoted as the basis for the typical identification: "Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation" (Isaiah 12: 3); "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you" (Ezekial 36: 25). In the upper right hand corner, the same explanation and scriptural authority are provided for the right panel of the triptych:

> We read in the thirteenth chapter of the book of Numbers that the messengers who were sent to explore the Land of Promise, when they returned, brought a cluster of grapes on a staff; and when they had crossed the Jordan, they brought it as a proof of the fruitfulness of the land: which signifies that, if we wish to enter the heavenly kingdom, we must first pass through the waters of baptism (p. 409).

The two biblical passages quoted are from Psalms and Zechariah: "Bless ye God in the congregations, even the Lord from the fountain of Israel" (Psalms 68: 26); "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David" (Zechariah 13: 1).

Although there are extant manuscripts of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries which present more typical identifications than the earlier manuscripts, the majority have forty panels, presenting the major scenes in the life of Christ, particularly those which lend themselves to pictorial representation. The question of the extent to which the *Biblia* determined typical identifications in the stained glass windows of St. Denis, Chartres, and Canterbury, in sculptures, and in such works as *Pictor in Carmine* is, perhaps, unanswerable. The text of the *Biblia* apparently determined the no longer extant stained glass designs in the forty convent windows of Hirschau, when the new cloister was erected in 1085 (sixty-five years before the windows at St. Denis). It is possible that the iconographic program of Abbot Suger was based upon such copies as the one used in the Hirschau construction, subsequently influencing Chartres and Canterbury, as well as other cathedrals and chapels. It is entirely possible, however, that other sources, as well as the ingenuity of the stained glass artists, supplied the impetus for the typical cycles in stained glass windows, and that the *Biblia* was widely circulated because it reflected current practice on the continent and in England. All of the typical identifications in the *Biblia* are repeated in *Pictor*; on the other hand, this is not so unusual when one considers that there are only eighty Old Testament types in the *Biblia* and 508 in *Pictor*. Unlike many of the stained glass windows and such treatises as *Pictor*, the *Biblia* was designed to reach the *völker* (*Pictura est laicorum scriptura*), and hundreds of manuscripts circulated even before the invention of the printing press. Unlike the individualistic identifications by other authors and by various artists, however, the Biblia represents a corpus of typical identifications which, because of its wide circulation, is an index to the basic types and antitypes of the Middle Ages. Moreover, as the following list indicates,[49] these identifications were so widely disseminated that an allusion to any aspect of a single triptych, in sermons, illuminated manuscripts, stained glass, enameled crosses, sculpture, and so on, would immediately bring to mind the remaining parts of the triptych.[50]

Type	Antitype	Type
1. The serpent and Eve	The Annunciation	Gideon and his fleece (Judges 6: 36)
2. Moses and the burning bush	The Nativity	The blossoming rod of Aaron

---

[49] This list is based on a thirteenth-century xylographic manuscript of Biblia in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris as it is reproduced in Musper.

[50] In an enamelled cross of the twelfth century, preserved in the British Museum, the image of the Hebrew spies and the grape cluster at the bottom of the vertical member is identical to the image found in the Biblia. The representation of the spies involves at least the following allusions: the crossing of the Red Sea and the destruction of the Egyptians; Moses' outstretched staff as a type of the cross; Joshua's crossing of the Jordan; the Christian's passage "beyond Jordan"; the Old and New Covenants, for the spies allegorically represent the old and new Law (the man in back, for example, can only see the "shadow" of the future as it is symbolized in the grape cluster, while the leading figure looks forward to the

3.	Saul's representative before David (II Samuel 3: 10)	The Adoration of the Magi	Sheba before Solomon
4.	Presentation of the first-born	The Purification	Samuel offered to Eli
5.	Jacob fleeing his brothers	The Flight into Egypt	Daniel fleeing Saul
6.	Moses destroying the golden calf	The Holy Family in Egypt	Destruction of Dagon (I Samuel 5)
7.	Saul slaying the priests who sheltered David	The Murder of the Innocents	Queen Athaliah slaying the royal line (II Kings 11: 1)
8.	David returns after Saul's death	The Return from Egypt	Jacob receiving his brothers in Egypt
9.	Crossing of the Red Sea	John baptizing Christ	The Hebrew spies and the grape cluster
10.	Esau sells his birthright	Temptation of Christ	Adam and Eve tempted by the serpent
11.	Elijah restores the widow's son	The raising of Lazarus	Elisha restores the child of the widow of Sarepta (III Kings 17)
12.	Abraham receives the angels	The Transfiguration	Three youths in the fiery furnace

---

Promised Land, that is, Heaven); the wine of the Eucharist (and hence the manna which prefigures the bread); and so on. (For a reproduction of this cross, see Tuve, A Reading of George Herbert, Frontispiece.) Even these allusions do not take into account the color symbolism of the medallion of the spies which would also be involved in the response of a medieval viewer.

13. Nathan before David (II Samuel 12)	Mary Magdalene at the feet of Christ	Miriam, Moses' sister, healed of leprosy (Numbers 12)
14. David praised after Goliath's death	Christ's entry into Jerusalem	Elisha praised on his return to Jerusalem (II Kings 1: 15)
15. Daniel orders the Temple cleansed	Christ driving the money-changers out of the Temple	Maccabaeus purifies the holy places (Esdras 4: 17)
16. Joseph's brothers betray him	Christ betrayed by Judas	Absalom plots against David
17. Joseph sold to the Ishmaelites	Judas receives his payment	Joseph sold to Potiphar (Genesis 39)
18. Melchizedek presents Abraham bread and wine	The Last Supper	The gathering of manna
19. Micah left by Jehoshaphat (I Kings 23)	Christ leaving disciples in Gethsemane	Elisha's warning disregarded (II Kings 6)
20. The wise and foolish virgins	Christ in the Garden of Olives	Lucifer falls from Heaven (Isaiah 14)
21. Joab treats Abner kindly and is betrayed	Judas betraying Christ with a kiss.	Tryphon betrays the men of Judah (I Maccabees 12)
22. Jezebel betrays Elijah	Pilate washing his hands	Daniel delivered to Nebuchadnezzar
23. Ham profanes Noah	Christ crowned with thorns	Hebrews bitten by serpents
24. Isaac bearing the wood for his sacrifice	Christ bearing His Cross	Elijah and the widow gathering sticks (I Kings 27: 10)

25. Abraham prepares to sacrifice Isaac	Christ on the Cross	Moses and the brazen serpent
26. Eve is taken from Adam's side	The Crucifixion and the soldier with a spear	Moses striking the rock
27. Joseph placed in the pit by his brothers	The Entombment of Christ	Jonah swallowed by the whale
28. David subdues Goliath	Christ descends into Hell	Samson kills the lion
29. Samson carries off the gates of the city	The Resurrection	Jonah is freed from the whale
30. Reuben looks for his brother Joseph (Genesis 37)	The three Marys and the angel at the tomb	Solomon seeks for his bride
31. Nebuchadnezzar rejoices to see Daniel alive	Christ appears to Mary Magdalene in the garden	Solomon finds his bride
32. Joseph reveals himself to his brothers	Christ appears to His disciples	The Prodigal Son returns
33. Gideon exhorted by the angel to believe	The disbelief of Thomas	Jacob wrestles with the Angel
34. Enoch is translated	The Ascension	Elias is carried into Heaven
35. The Law given to Moses on Sinai	The Descent of the Holy Spirit	Elijah calls down fire on the sacrifice (I Kings 18: 38)
36. Solomon honors his mother	The Coronation of the Virgin	Esther honors Ahasuerus (Esther 2: 17)

37. Solomon judges between the two mothers	The Last Judgement	David judges Saul's murderer (II Samuel 1)
38. Dathan and Abiram are condemned to Hell (Deuteronomy 9: 6)	The wicked in Hell	The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah
39. Job's sons rejoice	Christ with the souls of the blessed in His mantle	Jacob's vision of the ladder
40. Solomon rewards his bride	The reward of the righteous	The Church as Christ's bride (Revelations 22)

The *Biblia* is a work clearly designed to reach the people, for the illustrations and explanatory text are reduced to the most elementary level.[51] In addition, the biblical passages which are cited as support for the typical identifications quite often involve only verbal parallels which are related in no other way to the passage cited. In the identification of the types of Christ's baptism, for example, the two spies and the grape cluster were traditionally viewed as symbols of the wine of the Eucharist. The parallel which the author of the *Biblia* emphasizes, however, is the simple relation between Christ being baptized in the Jordan River and the spies crossing the same river. This is not to say that the author was unaware of the more complex symbolism associated with the types he identifies; he obviously was, but he reduces his identifications to terms which the simplest mind can grasp. The same is true of the scriptural passages cited as a support for identifying the crossing of the spies as an image of baptism. The citations from Psalms and Zechariah turn on the word *fountain*; other than this verbal parallel, there is no similarity. The scriptural passages cited to parallel the crossing of the Red Sea as a type of baptism turn upon *water*. In the same passage, however,

---

[51] In tone and style the prose passages in the *Biblia* are quite similar to many of the twelfth century homilies. In explaining the symbolism of the brazen serpent, for example, the compiler of the *Biblia* notes: "We read in Numbers 21: 9, that when the Lord willed to save the people from the serpents which had bitten them, He commanded Moses to make a brazen serpent and to hang it from a tree, so that whosoever looked upon it should be saved from the serpents. The serpent which was hung up and beheld by the people signifies Christ on the cross, whom all should behold who would be saved from the serpent, that is, the devil"(p. 419). In an anonymous homily of the early twelfth century, the author interprets the symbolism of the serpent differently, but the passage is as simply designed, reflecting the same purpose as that of the *Biblia*: "Moses, the leader, made in the great wilderness by God's command, a brazen serpent, when the people were being rent by serpents; and he then raised up the brazen serpent, even as a sign; and those who had been bitten there looked towards it, and they were immediately better. The brazen serpent, which was without venom, betokened the death of Christ, who suffered innocently, raised aloft upon the cross; and we look to him with complete faith, that we may

---

be freed by him from our sins . . ." (*Twelfth-Century Homilies in MS. Bodley 343*, ed. A. O. Belfour [Oxford: 1962], I, 11). The use of narrative techniques is a quite common device of such works, for the narrative framework, the series of simple events leading to a conclusion carefully prepared for, provide, as in Christ's parables, a simple means of ordering the listeners' response.

the author indicates that he is aware of the traditional identification of the Egyptians with man's evil passions: the Israelites were freed from the hosts of Pharaoh by "miraculous" water; Christian men are freed from sin by water. Yet, it is not the more complex identification of the Egyptians with sin which the author emphasizes but the miraculous efficacy of water. Moreover, the Latin inscriptions identifying each part of the triptych are written in the simplest terms, making certain that the figure presented in each scene is clearly identified, even if the actions represented are not. One should add, however, that what was "simple" to the medieval mind may be somewhat more complex to individuals unaccustomed to a completely religiously oriented universe; few modern readers are capable of identifying the allusions to Esther and Ahasuerus or to Tryphon's betrayal of the tribe of Judah. It is true that several of the types in the Biblia are based upon texts in the apocryphal books (I Maccabees and Esdras, for example) which, from the time of English Puritanism, have not been included in Protestant Bibles. On the other hand, few modern readers would recognize the distinction (made clear in the Biblia) between the Garden of Gethsemane and the Garden of Olives.

Approximately half of the eighty typical identifications in the Biblia are quite traditional; as early as

Justin Martyr, for example, the ten images associated with Moses and the Exodus had been viewed typologically. Many of the types identified in relation to such figures as Adam and Eve, Abraham, Isaac, Melchizedek, Joseph, and Joshua are a traditional part of the typological identifications of the Antiochene school, appearing in the earliest forms of Christian art, and being represented in the products of numerous medieval artists and craftsmen. These commonly represented types are presented without any indication that they are to be interpreted allegorically; in this sense, portions of the Biblia are as close to the New Testament practice as any typological interpretations since the fourth century. On the other hand, more than half of the types represented are related to Alexandrian allegory (the references to Solomon's "bride," for example), and do not, in the New Testament or Antiochene sense at any rate, utilize typology in any significant way. Several types, such as the ones related to the Coronation of the Virgin, are reflections of the theological commitments of the Middle Ages; and some, relatively few in number, are somewhat artificial. As in the corona window at Canterbury, those which are based on New Testament passages are allegorical representations and are not examples of typology. On the other hand, though such meanings may not have been apparent to the poorly educated worshippers, few of the actual types had escaped being allegorized by the Latin commentators; and the allegorical levels would certainly be apparent to the medieval religious whose duty it was to explain the text and representations of the _Biblia_ to the illiterate members of the parish. The triptych which relates Moses and the burning bush to the Annunciation is clearly interpreted by the compiler in the Alexandrian mode:

> This bush that burned, and which yet did not consume, figures the blessed Virgin Mary, who, bearing a Son without touching the purity of her body, because a virgin, gave birth and remained uncorrupted (p. 404).

In relation to the history of typology, however, the _Biblia_ itself is invaluable; for in it, the varying interpretations and hermeneutical principles of nearly 1,000 years are reflected as in a mirror.

In bemoaning the "sports of fancy" of stained glass artists, the author of _Pictor in Carmine_ also criticizes the introduction of secular materials into the decoration of the church:

> . . . which is more decent, which more profitable, to behold about the altar of God double-headed eagles, four lions with one and the same head, centaurs with quivers, headless men grinning, the so-called "logical" chimaera, the fabled intrigues of the fox and the lyre; or (surely) to contemplate the deeds of the Patriarchs, the rites of the Law, the deliverances wrought by the Judges, the symbolic acts of Kings, the conflicts of the Prophets. . . , the works of the Lord the Saviour, and the revealed mysteries of the Gospel in its

> first splendor? Is the panorama of the Old and New Testament so meagre that we must needs set aside what is comely and profitable, and, as the saying goes, make ducks and drakes of our money in favour of ignoble fancies? (p. 141).

As Goodenough has demonstrated, many of the basic symbols of Jewish art, which were then incorporated in Christian representations, are pagan in source. Such common symbols as fish, bread, and wine, for example, derive from Dionysiac rituals; "in the ancient world," as Goodenough notes, "a lingua franca of symbols developed which went from religion to religion, always keeping the old values."[52] The image of the "wine-press" which appears in relation to Eucharistic types, particularly the image of the two spies and the grape cluster, is a central aspect of Dionysiac ritual.[53] Numerous other pagan symbols, either through Jewish worship or directly from pagan sources, were absorbed into Christian art and architecture.[54] In some cases, such as the wine-press image, the symbols were modified enough to make them a central part of Christian art; in many cases, pagan symbols were often retained simply as decorative motifs. The author of Pictor, however, not only sees that typical identifications are becoming too much the "sports" of artists, but that classical representations which had previously served as peripheral decorations are beginning to assume a far too important place in church decoration. The "double-headed eagle" which the author finds an "ignoble fancy" is, of course, the Phoenix, traditionally viewed as a type of the Resurrection; the four lions with "one and the same head" is a reference to the four allegorical qualities of the lion which are applied to Christ: strength, majesty, courage, and fortitude. Each "ignoble" figure which the author of Pictor

---

[52] Goodenough, VI, 125.

[53] In the "great procession of Dionysus" the wine press, preceded by the priests, was carried on a four-wheeled cart, "thirty feet long, twenty-four feet wide, drawn by three hundred men; in this was set up a wine-press thirty-six feet long, twenty-two and a half feet wide, full of grapes. And sixty Satyrs trod them while they sang a vintage song to the accompaniment of pipes. . . . The new wine streamed through the whole line of march" (Goodenough, VI, 51).

[54] For the relationship of classical symbols and myths to the early Middle Ages, see Erwin Panofsky, "Introduction," Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes In the Art of the Renaissance (New York: 1939). Panofsky

---

notes that classical themes were never fully integrated in medieval art because of the "emotional disparity between the Christian Middle Ages and pagan Antiquity." He points out, however, that when Hellenic paganism could be "made subservient to Biblical or theological themes," when a "classical figure [was] presented . . . as a Virgin Mary," a somewhat uneasy fusion resulted (pp. 28-29).

Quite early in Christian iconography, for example, three of the four Evangelists were commonly represented by symbols primarily pagan in origin. Mark is represented by a winged lion, Luke by a winged bull, and John by an eagle; Matthew's symbol is a winged seraph strumming a harp. Such representations were retained in Protestant woodcuts; the rubrics at the beginning of the Gospels in Luther's New Testament, for example, are representations of these symbols. See Die Septemberbibel: Das Neue Testament deutsch von Martin Luther, ed. Wilhelm Scherer (Berlin: 1883), a facsimile of the 1522 Wittenberg edition.

sees supplanting Christian imagery has its origin in classical thought.[55] In many ways, Pictor in Carmine is a prophetic book; the author sees that over-ingenious identifications of the type-antitype will lead ultimately to a loss of meaning and a complete subordination to artistic design. Moreover, he identifies in the twelfth century the artistic impulses which will lead to the renewal of classical thought in the Renaissance. He is not, however, the only person who deplores such artistic representations; his contemporary, St. Bernard, condemns them with equal fervor:

> . . . In the cloisters, under the eyes of the brethren engaged in reading, what business has there that ridiculous monstrosity, that amazing misshapen shapeliness and shapely misshapenness? Those unclean monkeys? Those fierce lions? Those monstrous centaurs? Those semihuman beings? Those spotted tigers? Those fighting warriors? Those huntsmen blowing their horns? Here you behold several bodies beneath one head; there again

---

[55] James identifies two of the eight figures listed; the "headless men" are "Acephali, men with their faces in their chests," and the "logical" chimera, according to James, is found in Hesiod's definition of the "three parts of oratory" (p. 141, n. 3, 4). Centaurs are commonly represented as symbolizing "savage passions and excesses, especially the sin of adultery" (George Ferguson, Signs and Symbols in Christian Art [New York: 1966], p. 14); the "fabled intrigues" of the fox and the cock refer to the fables attributed to Aesop; and the reference to Boethius (which occurs in The Consolation of Philosophy, Book I, IV) alludes to the legend that "only the ass is deaf to [Appollo's] lyre." I have been unable to identify the reference to "monkeys playing the pipe," although I suspect it is a medieval corruption of the image of Pan.

> several heads upon one body. Here you see a quadruped with the tail of a serpent; there a fish with the head of a quadruped. There an animal suggests a horse in front and half of a goat behind; here a horned beast exhibits the rear part of a horse. . . .[56]

But St. Bernard's concern is somewhat different from that of Pictor; the former recognizes that these representations detract from "meditating on the Divine Law"; the latter, from an artist's viewpoint, recognizes that the inroads of secular materials are not only a detraction, but an open danger to Christian art. The celebration of the exploits of secular figures (the legends of Charlemagne in the windows at Chartres, for example), the introduction of allegorical personifications (as in the Canterbury windows which present the four cardinal virtues--Prudence, Temperance, Justice, and Fortitude), and even the Legends of the Saints (at St. Denis, Chartres, Sainte-Chapelle, Canterbury, and so on), mark the beginning of a process which will culminate in the secular art of the High Renaissance. By the first of the twelfth century, a counter-evolutionary process is beginning: Christian art which began by adapting Jewish (and pagan) symbols to religious themes reverses itself and begins the modification of religious symbolism through the assimilation of classical figures and motifs.

---

[56] Cited in Erwin Panofsky, Meaning in the Visual Arts (New York: 1955), pp. 132-133.

In analyzing the engravings of Albrecht Dürer (early sixteenth century), Erwin Panofsky traces this process in relation to a single image, Helios Pantokrator, the pagan sun-god, and Christ as the "sun of righteousness."[57] The sun-god, or Helios, did not play an overly important role in Greek religion until Rome fell under the influence of Egypt, particularly the Alexandrine artists. In Alexandria, however, the arts paid homage to the god in temples and countless images, calling him "All-Ruler, Spirit of the World, Power of the World, Light of the World." According to Panofsky,

> the religious experience of late antiquity was so closely allied to astral mysticism, and so thoroughly imbued with the belief in the omnipotence of the sun-god, that no new religious idea could gain acceptance unless it was either invested with solar connotations from the outset . . . or else acquired such solar connotations . . . , as was the case with Christianity. Christ was to triumph . . . , but even He could triumph only after--or, rather because--His cult had absorbed some of the vital features of sun worship, from the date of his birth (December 25) down to the tempest that lifts Him to heaven . . . (pp. 258-259).

In sanctioning the union, the Church finally substituted for the cosmological sun-god (Sol Invictus) the concept of a moral god, a "Sun of Righteousness" (Sol Justitiae). Such a transfer was made relatively simple because of the numerous passages in the Scriptures which equated Christ with the sun (". . . unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise" [Malachi 4: 2]), and because of Christ's own statements identifying himself as the "Light of the World." Although St. Augustine warned against the pagan implications of the identification, from the

---

[57] Panofsky, "Albrecht Dürer and Classical Antiquity," Meaning in the Visual Arts, pp. 256ff. My discussion of this process is simply a summary of Panofsky's work, except for the identification of the same image in the Biblia and in King's College Chapel windows. For the fifteen woodcuts which Dürer created for Luther's translation of the Book of Revelations, see The Complete Woodcuts of Albrecht Dürer, ed. Willi Kurth (New York: 1963), Plates 105-120.

> third century on it was one of the most popular and effective metaphors in ecclesiastical rhetoric; it played a large role in sermons and hymns; . . . to the early adherents of Christianity it was a "triumphant invocation" by which they "were moved to almost drunken ecstasy" (p. 260).

In the era of newly born Christianity, "the Biblical Sol displaced the pagan, whereas in the age of the Renaissance, the pagan Sol displaced the Biblical" (p. 260). The process was complete by the last decade of the fifteenth century; in one of the most popular books of the late Middle Ages (1489), Petrus Berchorius' Repertorium morale, a theological dictionary, Christ as Sol Justitiae is described on the Day of Judgment:

> . . . this Sun . . . shall be inflamed when exercising supreme power, that is to say, when He sits in judgment, when He shall be strict and severe . . . because He shall be all hot and bloody by dint of justice and strictness. For, as the sun, when in the center of his orbit, that is to say, at the midday point, is hottest, so shall Christ be when He shall appear in the center of heaven and earth,

> that is to say in Judgment. . . . In summer, when he is in the Lion, the sun withers the herbs, which have blossomed in spring, by his heat. So shall Christ, in that heat of the Judgment, appear as a man fierce and leonine; He shall wither the sinners and shall destroy the prosperity of men which they had enjoyed in the world.[58]

Panofsky traces these developments as examples of the influence of classical art on Durer's early Renaissance woodcuts. He does not note, however, that the image of Christ as Sol Justitiae is already present in the early twelfth century, not in a theological dictionary, but in an illustrated work designed for the ignorant masses: the Biblia Pauperum. Christ, on the Day of Judgment, is surrounded by what appears to be a huge aureole; it is in fact a rather crudely carved sun;[59] beneath his feet the graves give up the dead. Moreover, in the strict type-antitype cycles in the windows of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, one panel seems to have no place in the balancing designs: The Temple of the Sun.

---

[58] Cited in Panofsky, p. 262.

[59] The scene is presented in triptych No. 37. The same woodcut also appears in the Speculum Humanae Salvationis (Didron, II, 209). In Georgette de Montenay's Emblemes, ou Devises Chrestiennes, an emblem book published in 1571, the same image, somewhat softened, appears. Emblem 37 presents a man carrying a torch above the Bible; in the sky, the face of Christ is portrayed as the sun. Montenay's text reads:

Thou ar redy, thein cunning,
  Us to teach very willing,
Aut of that Booke, which in thy handes,
  Open al wayes, before thy standes,
But thou [the man in the emblem] are wiked, and
  canst not see,
  Whey shal wee be lernet of thy?
Then one needs not goe, by a candle lyght,
  When the sunn beames, shine to bright (p. 176).

In the history of the development of typology, however, the resurgence of classical imagery is seen most clearly in a specific genre which developed in Italy, appeared in France and England in the early sixteenth century, and subsequently became a perennial favorite of the Puritans: the emblem books. Critics have long recognized that the unusual popularity of emblem books was a result of their unique combination of the seemingly contradictory classical and religious traditions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,

> . . . the traditions of non-literal, typological [allegorical] interpretation of Holy Scripture and the similar ingenuities practised by students of profane letters who scrutinized Homer, Virgil, Ovid, and other classical authors to discover the esoteric, doctrinal, and ethical contents which were supposed to underlie the surface of their meaning.[60]

Of the two traditions, however, the classical is the dominant one. The use of the picture ("emblem") and interpretative text, and the allegorical method of interpretation are characteristically medieval; but the illustrations selected and the specific interpretations are only nominally so. As Rosemary Freeman points out,

---

[60] Chew, The Virtues Reconciled, p. 34. Chew does not distinguish between typology and allegory, using the terms as roughly synonymous. His discussion of the allegorical personification of the four virtues makes clear, however, that the virtues are not a part of typological interpretations. I have, therefore, inserted the more correct term allegorical in this citation.

> . . . the emblems are not so much mediaeval in their interest as renaissance: they draw upon stock mediaeval symbols for some of their material, but some of it is also classical, and is derived from Greek and Roman legends, from classical history, and from Ovid. In Italy, where they first appeared, their classical affinities were at least as important as their mediaeval. . . . Furthermore, although the fashion is linked through its allegorical material with the surviving interests of the Middle Ages, the way in which the themes are treated is not mediaeval at all.[61]

The allegorical way of thinking, as Freeman notes, was "pervasive and habitual; if it had not been, the emblem books would not have existed at all." She concludes, however, that allegory had ". . . ceased to be pervasive and habitual in the mediaeval fashion: allegory had become an interest for its own sake instead of a means of interpreting the universe."[62] The term emblemata originally signified "mosaic work"; as applied to the earliest emblem, it retained the sense of "putting the pieces together," much the same as a modern jig-saw puzzle represents a "mosaic" where all of the pieces must be made to match the original pattern. While Philo-Judaeus developed his allegorical methods of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures, his Alexandrian contemporaries were intent upon interpreting the Egyptian hieroglyphs:

---

[61] Rosemary Freeman, English Emblem Books (London: 1948), p. 19.

[62] Freeman, p. 31. In discussing the emblems themselves, Freeman also points out the precise qualities which distinguish the pictorial qualities of the emblem book from medieval art: "In all its forms, it remains unlike the earlier type of allegory: in the emblem books the treatment of the abstract symbol, the stiffness of the personified figures, the imposition of moral significance upon straightforward unallegorical stories, the introduction of purely figurative detail in the plates and the interpretation of realistic detail there in a figurative way, all bear witness to the forced and arbitrary nature of Elizabethan and Jacobean symbolism" (p. 31).

> It was thought that the hieroglyphs were a purely ideographical form of writing, that with them the Egyptian priests foreshadowed divine ideas, and that the Greek philosophers had drawn upon hieroglyphic wisdom.[63]

As a part of the renaissance of humanistic learning in fifteenth century Italy, the emblems were revived, as Praz notes, as a "humanistic attempt to give a modern equivalent of the hieroglyphs . . ." (p. 23). The first emblem book appeared in Italy in 1531, the Annotationes in Pandectas of Andrea Alciati; emblem books which reached England and the first English books themselves were in the form established by Alciati.[64] Alciati's emblems are chiefly from natural history, fable, and mythology; George

---

[63] Mario Praz, Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery, 2nd ed. (Rome: 1964), p. 23. For a brief analysis of the relationship of hieroglyphics to the early emblem books, see The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo, ed. George Boas (New York: 1950).

[64] Freeman discusses in detail Alciati's influence on French, Spanish, and English emblem books (pp. 38ff.).

Whitney's A Choice of Emblems (1586), the first English emblem book, presents three divisions: Historical, Natural, and Moral. Whitney's work, apart from being the first English book, is largely derivative: of the 248 woodcuts, for example, 202 were printed from the identical blocks used by Alciati and a French compilation published by Plantin; as Freeman notes, A Choice of Emblems is "characterized by a complete absence of originality" (p. 56).

Yet Whitney's book is important from the standpoint of typology, for it is to his book that the first set of emblem writers turned for their model. Although much of the influence is ultimately derived from Alciati, Whitney establishes a method of treating religious subjects, which, with relatively few exceptions, dominates emblem literature for nearly 100 years. In the process, typology, even as it is related to the remnants of medieval allegory in the emblems, ceases to exist. Classical allegory, based upon fables, myths, and classical figures, is the dominant method of the emblem books; the tenuous relation which typology had to medieval allegory is not retained, even when allegorical subjects are based on medieval examples. Moreover, since most of the woodcuts were derivative, typological illustrations are supplanted by classical ones. Mario Praz is correct when he notes that emblems in

England follow "the tradition of the Biblia pauperum . . . , thus fulfilling in the seventeenth century the function performed by the bas-reliefs of the cathedrals in the Middle Ages" (p. 169). And Chew and Freeman are correct when they note that illustrated manuscripts, tapestries, and illuminated Bibles had prepared the way for the swift acceptance of the emblem genre.[65] On the other hand, illuminated Bibles are Bibles, and typology even as a part of allegory has a raison d'etre; such is not true in relation to classical images. In Whitney's Choice,[66] for example, none of the 248 woodcuts is typological; 110 deal expressly with classical myth (Tantalus, Ulysses, Prometheus, Hercules, Cupid, Nemesis, etc.) or with Greek and Roman historical figures (Pythagorus, Pompey, Horace, Virgil, Archimedes, Diogenes, etc.); 98 present natural legends (the crafty fox [fifteen separate emblems], the mother ape smothering her young, the busy bee, the prudent ant, etc.) or scenes from nature (the beaver, elephant, crocodile, lion, ostrich, whale, greedy sow, dogs, eels, trees, storms, sowing grain, fishing, etc.); only 40 emblems are called "Moral," although he often attaches a statement of sententia to "Historical" or "Natural" emblems. Whitney makes clear on the title page that his purpose is two-fold: dulce et utile:

---

[65] See Chew, pp. 24ff.; and Freeman, Chap. 2, "The Beginnings of Emblem Writing in England," pp. 37-55.

[66] My citations are based on the first edition, A Choice of Emblemes, and Other Devises, For the moste parte gathered out of sundrie writers, Englished and Moralized (Leydon: 1586).

> A worke adorned with variety of matter, both pleasant and profitable: wherein those that please, maye finde to fit their fancies: Bicause herein, by the office of the eie, and the eare, the minde maye reape dooble delights through holsome preceptes, shadowed with pleasant devises: both fit for the vertuous, to their incoraging: and for the wicked, for their admonishing and amendment.

He quite often attaches a moral to a myth (Tantalus, for example), and many of the texts commenting on natural scenes and animals are concluded, somewhat hastily at times, with "holsome preceptes." In no case, however, does Whitney interpret an emblem typologically. Even in emblems dealing with traditional typical identifications, Whitney's interpretation is couched in such broad terms that even the original significance of the biblical passage is diluted. In one of the two emblems dealing with Adam, for example, the woodcut shows a figure hiding behind a tree; the text reads:

> Behind a figtree great, him selfe did ADAM hide:
> And thought from God hee there might lurke, &
>   should not be espide.
> Oh foole, no corners seeke, thoughe thou a sinner
>   bee;
> For none but GOD can thee forgive, who all thy
>   waies doth see (p. 229).

The second reference to Adam is based on an allegorical interpretation of the Myth of Sisyphus; the source, Whitney notes in the margin, is from Ovid's Metamorphoses:

> Loe SISYPHUS, that roles the restlesse stone
> To toppe of hill, with endlesse toile, and paine;
> Which beinge there, it tumbleth doune alone,
> And then, the wretche must force it up againe;
> And as it falles, he makes it still ascende;
> And yet, no toile can bringe this worke to ende.
>
> This SISYPHUS: presenteth Adams race.
> The restlesse stone: their travaile, and their toile:
> The hill, dothe shew the daye, and eeke the space,
> Wherein they still doe labour, worke, and moile.
> And thoughe till nighte they strive the hill to clime,
> Yet up againe, the morning nexte betime (p. 215).

Even certain classical myths which the Church Fathers had interpreted as types of Christ are allegorized by Whitney in a completely different way. The myth of the Phoenix, for example, is dedicated to his "countrimen of the Namptwiche in Cheshire"; he relates the legend to the recent destruction of the town by fire:

> . . . I thought uppon your towne destroyed with fire:
> And did in minde, the newe NAMPWICHE behoulde,
> A spectacle for anie mans desire:
> Whose buildings brave, where cinders weare but late,
> Did represente (me thought) the Phoenix fate.
>
> And as the oulde, was manie hundreth years,
> A towne of fame, before it felt that crosse:
> Even so, (I hope) this Wiche, that nowe appeares,
> A Phoenix age shall laste, and knowe no losse:
> Which God vouchsafe, who make you thankfull, all:
> That see this rise, and saw the other fall (p. 177).

Although there are differences between Whitney and the major emblematists which follow him (Henry Peacham, Francis

Quarles, and George Wither), his book establishes a general format which is not changed: typological identifications do not occur and allegorical interpretations are based on classical, not medieval, examples.

Before the publications of Peacham, Quarles, and Wither in the first four decades of the seventeenth century, however, two authors, one French and one English, published emblem books which are in some ways more closely related to the Christian heritage of the Middle Ages. The first, Georgette de Montenay's *Emblemes, ou Devises Chrestiennes*,[67] was published in 1571, fifteen years before Whitney's *Choice*. Although none of the 100 emblems cites scripture as a basis for the picture or accompanying text (as Quarles does), many of the emblems refer implicitly to biblical passages. In Emblem 67, for example, the engraving presents three youths being driven into a fire, an obvious allusion to the three Hebrew youths and the fiery furnace (which in the *Biblia* is listed as a type of the Transfiguration). Neither in relation to this emblem nor to any other, however, is the identification made explicit in the accompanying text:

---

[67] My citations are from the polyglot edition (Latin, Spanish, Italian, High Dutch, English, and Low Dutch) published in Frankfort in 1619 under the title, *A Booke of armes, or remembrance, wherein at one Hundred Godly Emblemata, in peeces of brasse very fine graven, and adorned pleasant to be seen. . . .*

> If one is persecutet, with a sworde,
>   Because he loves, that Godly word,
> Or is driven in to a stron fire,
>   Such one mus never dispayre
> But thinke that he not to such mus fraune,
>   If he will ottein the heavenly croune,
> And after thinkes, live in Paradise,
>   Where all the Angels, God doo prise (p. 298).

The engravings depict human figures in the style of the early Italian Renaissance; none of the figures has the elongated face and body which reflects the Byzantine influence in medieval stained glass, illustrated manuscripts (the Biblia, for example), and tapestries. There is something slightly incongruous in Emblem 70, which depicts two struggling Herculean figures (p. 311), for the text makes clear that they represent Cain and Abel:

> Do not, with thein brother strive,
>   So thu wilt, long time live,
> And the Sonne, that shines so bright,
>   Shal no goe under from thy queit. . . .

Unlike Whitney, however, each of the emblems is interpreted in a specifically Christian sense; apart from the engravings, there is little classical influence in the Devises Chrestiennes.[68] Both de Montenay and Whitney have emblems

---

[68] As a matter of fact, de Montenay, in the only emblem which specifically refers to a classical figure, is not reluctant to point out the error of King Lycurgus of Sparta:

> King Lycurgus throug Sparta lande,
>   Did give ernest Commandement,
> That all the plantes of a wein,

on the thorny rose bush; the engravings and text make clear the basic difference between the two approaches. In Devises the rose bush is depicted with huge thorns; a single flower is almost concealed in the bramble. To de Montenay the thorns represent the wicked who attempt to hide God's word:

> The bushes of bramble, they grow so stout,
> To obscure that flowre, round about,
> Because no man shal them admier,
> And presently, might desier;
> So will the wiked, that Godly Word,
> Obscure with lyes, in this world,
> But let them hynder what they can
> It shall be seen, of every man (p. 186).

On the other hand, Whitney's engraving depicts a Renaissance gentleman carefully plucking the roses; the statement of moral is the proverbial "sweetes and sower" aspect of life:

> . . . When winter endes, comes in the pleasant spring.
> When nighte is done, the gladsome daye appeares.
> When greifes be gone, then joye doth make us sing.
> When stormes be paste, the variing weather cleares.
> So after paines, our pleasures make us glad,
> But without sower, the sweet is hardlie had
> (p. 165).

The classical source of the text, as the marginal note makes clear, is from Claudius. Although a number of de Montenay's emblems reflect biblical passages traditionally

---

> Should be cut downe presently;
> Because the men, doo God abuse,
> When they of such, make a use.
> But see, the wein is not in faut,
> Alon he, that drinkes much at (Emblem 51).

interpreted typologically,[69] neither types nor typological terminology appear in her text. Even the allegorical interpretations cannot be described as medieval, for the intellectual "toughness" of medieval allegory has been supplanted by a less rigorous sense of Christian struggle. De Montenay's world is aristocratic, cultured, and less demanding than the medieval world; the Devises is, essentially, a woman's devotional book.

The single emblem book which has the closest ties to the Middle Ages was published in 1592, fourteen years after Whitney's classically oriented collection: Andrew Willet's Sacrorum Emblematum Centuria Una, the only emblem book which utilizes typology and medieval allegory.[70]

---

[69] Emblem 13 presents an image of Jacob's ladder; Emblem 52 illustrates the Last Judgment; and Emblem 79 presents an image of Moses on Mt. Sinai. In each case, however, the text interprets the image in a general, non-typological sense. Moses on Sinai, for example, represents the life of prayer:

> He that is wiked, and will not pray,
>   To his God, by night or day,
> That man shall him, never finde,
>   So long he thus not change his minde;
>
> Alon he, that loves to pray, and call,
>   As Moyses did, continuall,
> Such one, will God allwayes hould,
>   Because to him, his handes did fould (p. 346).

[70] Andrew Willet, Sacrorum Emblematum Centuria Una (Cambridge: n.d.). All citations refer to this edition. Freeman has established that the book was published between February, 1591, and August, 1592 (see p. 63n).

Willet divides his emblems into three classes: "*Emblemata Typica sive Allegorica*" (twenty-five emblems), "*Emblemata Historica*" (fifty-three), and "*Emblemata Physica a rerum natura sumpta*" (twenty-two). The categories are somewhat misleading, however, for the emblems selected for each section are based upon scriptural citations: the section on "historical emblems" includes no references to secular events, but solely to biblical history; the "natural" emblems are such plants and animals which are mentioned in the Bible. It is difficult to tell precisely how much Willet knew of typology and its relation to medieval allegory. For one reason, his work is a "naked" emblem book, that is, only text and no engravings; if illustrations had been included in the *Sacrorum*, his knowledge of medieval traditions might have been made clearer. Further, it is impossible to determine whether he uses the term *sive* (*Emblemata Typica sive Allegorica*) as a simple disjunctive ("or"), or in the more limited sense of "or rather, or more accurately." His analysis suggests that he may be using the phrase as "Typical emblems, or rather, Allegorical [Emblems]," indicating a knowledge of the distinctions between typology and medieval allegory. Moreover, as his prefatory remarks indicate, Willet is aware of earlier works; he also appears to be attempting to adapt classical imagery to indigenous materials:

> Lest, as they say, I should have done something already accomplished, or should have brought my sickle into another's field, I wished to make my own attempt, even while pointing my finger at so holy a source, and dabbling my foot within it. Thus, although in the same line of endeavor, by taking another route, I might be able to satisfy us (p. A2).

In either case, Willet includes some twenty traditional typical identifications in the 100 emblems. Two of these (Noah's Ark and Abraham and Melchizedek) are interpreted with only the slightest trace of medieval (Alexandrian) allegory; Willet's parallels are nearly identical to those of Justin Martyr. In Emblem 18 ("De Ecclesia"), for example, Noah's ark is identified as a type of baptism:

Noah'is old and auncient arke,
Doth represent Christ little barke,
For as the Lord did Noah teach,
The Church doth here Christ onely preach,
Without the ship they perish all,
Without the Church men erre and fall,
The waters up the arke did beare,
This type to Baptisme commeth neare.
As Cham was saved among the rest,
So hypocrites live with the best,
Wolves, lambs, kids, lions, have one place,
So cruell men once cald finde grace.
With flood and weather th'Arke is tost,
So is the Church but nothing lost,
For as the pitch the ship doth keep,
So faith preserveth in perils deep.[71]

The identification of Melchizedek as a type of Christ occurs in Emblem 63:

---

[71] I identify the emblems by number instead of page because the pagination has been incorrectly set in the Cambridge edition. For Origen's interpretation of the ark as a type of baptism, and as an illustration of the differences between the Alexandrian methods and Willet's approach, see above, Chap.I, pp. 85ff.

> Bread and wine to Abraham bring
> Melchisedech doth both priest and king:
> He blesseth him with speach full grave,
> The other tithes unto him gave:
> . . . A type of Christ his precious blood,
> And flesh for bread must be our foode:
> Of righteousnes and peace they call
> Him king, which fitly on Christ fall,
> For he shall judge the world most just,
> On him for peace depend we must.[72]

Willet need not have known any of the commentaries of the patristic commentators to make these identifications; both Noah and Melchizedek are identified in the New Testament as types of Christ. That he knew the commentaries of the Latin Fathers, however, seems quite possible; for all of the remaining eighteen typical identifications are allegorized in much the same way as in the medieval commentaries. He may also have known the Biblia Pauperum (or some other similar source), for sixteen of the twenty typical identifications also appear in the Biblia.[73] Although these parallels do not provide enough evidence to suggest a specific source, it seems clear that, unlike the other emblem writers, Willet attempts to adapt the classical genre to native traditions; moreover, unlike any of the other early emblematists, Willet does not use classical subjects. Yet, he does not escape the simple statement of moral which characterizes such books as Whitney's; even though he bases his statements on scriptural sources, his _sententia_ is somewhat simplistic. His verse on Proverbs 20: 11 ("Even a child is known by his doings, whether his work be pure, and whether it be right") is characteristic of this--the dominant--aspect of his work:

---

[72] Willet's text is in both Latin and English. Although in the case of Noah and Melchizedek he uses silmu and praecursor instead of typos, he does translate both terms as "type."

[73] The emblems are: Noah (Emblem 18), Jacob's Ladder (14), The Manna (41), Moses and the Burning Bush (42), Jacob and Esau (44), Solomon the Judge (49), The Brazen Serpent (51), Jonah (53), Ham and Noah (54), Jezebel's Downfall (58), The Destruction of Dagon (61), Melchizedek (63), Adam and Eve Tempted (64), and Moses Receiving the Law (72) (the accounts of Jacob and Esau and Moses receiving the Tables of the Law are used twice). Willet also includes four allegories which are not found in the Biblia; three of them, however (Elijah fed by the ravens, the

> A Scholler must in youth be taught,
> And three things keepe in minde ful sure,
> Gods worship that it first be saught,
> And manners then with knowledge pure:
> In Church, in scoole, at table must he,
> Devout, attent, and handsome be (Emblem 67).

Tabernacle as a prefiguration of the Church, and the miraculous appearance of quail in the Wilderness), are quite common. The fourth, an allegorical interpretation of the golden candlestick of the Temple, does not appear in medieval iconography, although it is common in Puritan writings (see above, Introduction, Note 20). The text is in many ways similar to the Puritans' use of the same image:

> "The Prophet espieth a golden candlesticke,
> Seven burning lamps shine in the top thereof,
> So many pipers there are, which oyle minister,
> Two olive trees, which upon each side doe stand,
> The Prophet seeth, they give oyle abundantlie.
> The Church and house of Christ is this candlesticke,
> The lampes doe shew forth Gods graces manifold.
> The pipes which runne oyle signifie ministers,

As Freeman points out, Willet's book is not characteristic of the emblem literature as a whole; succeeding authors follow the patterns established by Whitney and the Italian emblematists, and de Montenay and Whitney, are, even in their own time, somewhat of an anachronism. Typology in its relation to the visual arts lingers on in peripheral ways, as does medieval allegorical methods; in the emblems of Peacham, Quarles, and Withers, an occasional image will appear to reflect medieval traditions, and, in rare instances, the moral allegorizing of the emblem texts will touch briefly on traditional medieval subjects. Although the impulse underlying the remaining emblem books may generally be called Christian, it is, except in the case of Quarles, humanistic Christianity, not medieval.[74] In Henry Peacham's Minerva Britanna (1612), of 203 emblems, only a few are based upon specific biblical passages; none is interpreted typologically. An emblem of a youthful Adam shows a serpent about his loins and one eating at his

---

> This oyle the spirit is, Christ is the olive tree.
> Alwaies at their neede, he readie is at hand,
> As running spring his Prophets he cherisheth"(Emblem 8).

[74] Norman S. Grabo's failure to make this distinction clearly limits the value of his discussion of Edward Taylor's debt to the emblem writers. The statement that the "symbols pictured were largely medieval" is true only in the sense that the classical images in emblem engravings had persisted throughout the Middle Ages, but not in the Latin Fathers, as he implies. (See Edward Taylor [New Haven: 1961], pp. 154ff.).

heart; the naked figure, walking among thorns and rocks, wears a blindfold:

> His age denotes youthes follies and amisse,
> His blindness shewes, our want of wisedomes sight;
> Sinnes deadly waies, those dang'rous stepps of his,
> His nakednes, of grace deprived quite:
> Hell's power the Serpent, which his loines doth girt,
> A Conscience bad, the other eates his heart.[75]

Significantly, the marginal citation upon which the emblem is based is not from Genesis but from Cicero: "*Grave pondus Conscientia*." As with Whitney, many of Peacham's emblems are Italian in origin, even though the engravings are original; Peacham cites from the same classical sources and uses the same mythological figures found in Whitney's *Choice*. Yet, Peacham, who futilely sought preferment at Court,[76] is much more aware of contemporary events, and much of the secular material which he introduces in the emblems refers to contemporary figures. Many are dedicated to the royal family and members of the court circle (King James, Queen Anne, the Duke of York, the Duke of Wales, Sir Francis Bacon, etc.); in some cases, one suspects that the effusive compliments are little more than attempts to gain preferment or a state position of some kind.[77] Even for the times, his praise is somewhat extravagant, as in the case of his emblem on the Phoenix. The emblem is addressed to the Earl of Salisbury, Lord High Treasurer:

---

[75] Henry Peacham, *Minerva Britanna, or a Garden of Heroical Devises* (London: 1612), Bk. II, 146.

[76] For a discussion of Peacham's career, see Freeman, pp. 68ff.

Th'Arabian PHOENIX heere, of golden plumes,
And bicie brest, upon a sacred pile
Of sweetest odors, thus himself consumes;
By force of PHOEBUS fiery beames, the while,
   From foorth the ashes of the former dead,
   A faire, or fairer, by and by his bred.

You, you (Great Lord) this wondrous PHOENIX are,
Who waste your selfe in Zeale, and whot desire,
Of Countries good, till in the end your care
Shall worke your end, as doth this PHOENIX fire.
   But while you are consuming in the same,
   You breede a second, your immortall Fame (I, 89).

Peacham's approach to the Phoenix legend illustrates an increasing secularization of the emblem books. It is true that many of his poems end with a nominally Christian statement of moral; in addition, unlike Whitney, Peacham occasionally cites in the marginal notes from such Church Fathers as Augustine and St. Bernard. In Emblem 45 depicting Orpheus' lyre, for example, he ends the verse with a single statement asking God to tune his soul, "From discord drawne, to sweetest unitie." The marginal notes include citations from the book of Proverbs, Augustine, and Ovid. Yet, in the Minerva one is increasingly aware that Whitney views the three separate sources as equally authoritative. Moreover, for the first time in any emblem book, classical authors are defended as sources as valid as religious ones. In discussing Adam's sin Peacham indicates that in life's maze only God can lead man aright. In Emblem 69 (Book I), however, Pallas Athene is also identified as a guide:

---

[77] Peacham's Royalist sympathies are reflected in Emblem 171. The engraving presents a "puritan" high-crowned hat placed over the King's crown. Peacham's sentiments are clearly expressed in the verse:

"Say what's the reason thus a hat we see,
Since Diadem's of Princes ever yet,
From base controule, have been exempt and free:
   There is a sect, whome PURITANS they call,
   Whose pride this Figure fitteth best of all.

"Not such I meane, as are of Faith sincere,
And to doe good endevour all they can,
Would all the world of their religion were,
We taxe the'aspiring factious Puritan:
   Whose Paritie, doth worst confusion bring,
   And Pride presumes to overlooke his King."

> Lo Pallas heere, with heedeful eie doth leade;
> Ulisses in his travaile farre an neere:
> That he aright, might in his Journey Treade,
> And shunne the traine of Error, everywhere:
> N'ought had Ulisses, ever brought to passe,
> But this great Goddesse, his directresse was.
>
> Though Homer did invent it long agoe,
> And we esteeme it as a fable vaine:
> While here we wander, it doth wisely show,
> With all our actions, Wisedome should remaine;
> And where we goe, take Pallas still along
> To guide our feete, our eares, and lavish tongue.[78]

---

[78] The marginal citations for this emblem are from Euripides, Homer, and from Aristotle's advice to princes: "Wisedome is only the Princes vertue." Had Peacham allotted more importance in the emblems to Pallas Athena

There is little doubt that Peacham was familiar with medieval as well as classical thought. He was a competent artist as well as a fine engraver;[79] and he could hardly have been unaware of the typical cycles in King's College Chapel, for he took his Master of Arts at Cambridge. His outlook, however, is thoroughly Renaissance; typology and medieval allegory are simply a·part of the non-classical past.

The most popular emblem writer was, of course, Francis Quarles; when the Emblems (1635) and Hieroglyphikes of the Life of Man (1638) were issued in a combined edition in 1639, 5,000 copies were printed, and more than twenty editions of the 1639 volume were issued in the seventeenth century. Quarles's popularity is not easy to explain; in part, as Freeman suggests, he appealed to a large number of readers, for he had a "trick of taking the reader into his confidence" and a "fondness for compound epithets which looked impressive and yet could easily be

---

(Minerva), one might be able to attach more significance to the title of his collection, Minerva Britanna.

[79] Peacham's first book was a handbook for painters, The Gentleman's Exercise. One section is devoted to the treatment of allegorical themes, showing how ". . . to portract and expresse Eternitie, Hope, Victorie, Pietie, Providence, Vertue, Time, Peace, Concord, Fame, Common Safetie, Clemencie, Fate, etc. as they have been by Antiquitie described either in Coines, Statues, or other the like Public Monuments . . ." (cited in Freeman, p. 70).

reduced to their simple parts," thus affording "the reader with a pleasant sense of intellectual achievement without overmuch intellectual effort" (p. 126). Still, there is a distracting monotony in the subject matter and style of the poetry which could hardly go unnoticed by any contemporary reader. Pope, who "despised Quarles and mocked at the whole emblem fashion," is not much closer to understanding Quarles when he asserts in The Dunciad that "the pictures for the page atone / And Quarles is sav'd by Beauties not his own . . ." (I, 11. 139-140); for much of the monotony of the verse is derived from the stylized engravings. In the Emblemes, for example, two Cupid figures (representing sacred and profane love)[80] and a globe are the basic images of all of the sixty engravings on which the verses are based; further, each engraving in the Hieroglyphikes presents as a central image a single candle (which becomes shorter in each succeeding emblem) representing the course of man's life. Unlike Peacham, Quarles is not cosmopolitan and urbane; he makes no appeals to the aristocratic classes, but directs his verses primarily at the rising Puritan middle class. Moreover, Quarles makes it clear that the renaissance of classical learning is a part of the world's evil; he clearly takes his stand on the side of the angels. In Books I and II of the Emblemes Quarles establishes the conflict between the world of man and the world of God; in each engraving, one cupid-like figure clearly represents the temptations of the world, the other the aspirations of the soul. Each emblem begins with a biblical passage condemning the lures of the world: "The fashion of this world passeth away" (I Corinthians 7: 31); "All is vanity and vexation of Spirit" (Ecclesiastes 2: 17); "The world passeth away, and all the lusts thereof" (I John 2: 17). There is in fact almost a note of hysteria in the Emblemes, a rising crescendo of personal revulsion. In Emblem II (Book II), for example, the engraving presents one figure grasping a small globe; the second figure, complete with halo, raises its hand in admonishment and warning. The text on which the verse is based is from Ecclesiastes: "There is no end of all his labour; neither is his eye satisfied with riches" (4: 8). After explaining the significance of the various objects in the emblem, the poem continues:

---

[80] For an excellent discussion of the metamorphosis of the pagan Cupid into the image of Divine Love, see Praz, "Profane and Sacred Love," pp. 82-168.

> We sack, we ransack to the utmost sands
> Of native kingdoms and of foreign lands:
> We travel sea and soil; we pry, we prowl,
> We progress, and we prog from pole to pole:
> We spend our mid-day sweat, our midnight oil;
> We tire the night in thought, the day in toil:
> We make art servile, and the trade gentile,
> (Yet both corrupted with ingenious guile,)
> To compass Earth, and with her empty store

> To fill our arms, and grasp one handful more:
> Thus seeking rest our labours never cease,
> But, as our years, our hot desires increase:
> Thus we, poor little worlds! with blood and sweat,
> In vain attempt to comprehend the great:
> Thus, in our gain, become we gainful losers,
> And what's enclosed encloses the enclosers.
> Now, reader, close thy book, and then advise;
> Be wisely worldly, be not worldly wise:
> Let not thy nobler thoughts be always raking
> The world's base dunghill; vermin's took by taking:
> Take heed thou trust not the deceitful lap
> Of wanton Delilah: the world's a trap.[81]

Quarles not only stands with the Godly, he establishes a framework which rigidly excludes classical images; unlike Peacham, he identifies classical learning with the evils of the world. Each emblem begins with a citation from the Scriptures; the verses explain the various objects and significance of the engraving; each emblem then ends with citations of a general moral import from one or more of the Church Fathers (usually Augustine) and a two-couplet epigram summarizing the complete unit. In Emblem XIII (Book I), for example, the biblical citation is from I John 3: 19: "Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." The engraving presents one figure riding a hart through the woods; the other rides an ass, accompanied by a snail, up a steep incline. If the temptations of the world (Pleasure, Honor, Profit) beckon, Quarles says, "how fast and fearless do our footsteps flee!" But "when our dull souls direct their thoughts to thee, / The soft-pac'd snail is not so slow as we." The unit ends with two citations from Augustine; the first clearly establishes the central conflict for the religious:

---

[81] Francis Quarles, Emblems, Divine and Moral (London: 1839), p. 60. All citations refer to this edition, which has been checked with the original edition for accuracy.

> Two several loves built two cities: the love of GOD builds a Jerusalem; the love of the world builds a Babylon. Let every one inquire of himself what he loveth, and he shall resolve himself of whence he is a citizen.

Quarles specifically associates classical mythology and allegorical personifications with the secular, evil world. And he explicitly renounces the aid of the "Sacred Nine":

> How shall my tongue express that hallow'd fire
> Which heaven hath kindled in my ravish'd heart?
> What muse shall I invoke that will inspire
> My lowly quill to act a lofty part?
> What art shall I devise t'express desire
> Too intricate to be express'd by art?
> Let all the Nine be silent; I refuse
> Their aid in this high task, for they abuse
> The flames of love too much: assist me David's Muse
> (p. 100).

Unlike other emblematists, there is in Quarles a zeal, a religious intensity which, in its own way, is closer to the medieval religious enthusiast than to his own day. This, in part, accounts for his popularity, particularly with the Puritans; and, in part, accounts for Pope's dislike. In addition, his insistence upon a vision of the universe as the arena for the moral struggle between the flesh and the spirit, his clear subordination of secular learning to the spiritual quest, and, at times, his identification of classical learning with the wiles of Satan, are all characteristically medieval. These qualities are the ones which Puritans admired in Quarles. Quarles is not a typologist and his allegory is not characteristic of medieval allegory.[82] But he does present a Weltanschauung which is totally religious.

There are, of course, numerous other emblem books, yet none of these is in any significant way different from the ones discussed here; types do not appear and only rarely are there examples of medieval allegory.[83] Because of the combination of images and devotional poetry, emblem books represent the last genre in which the traces of

---

[82] Several of Quarles's engravings are based upon traditional types, but he never interprets them in a typological sense (see Emblems I and II, Book I, for example). The term type appears only twice in his work; in both cases he uses the term to refer to the engraving. In the "Address to the Reader" he notes that "an embleme is but a silent parable. Let not the tender eye check to see the allusion to our blessed Saviour figured in the type. In Holy Scripture, he is sometimes called a sower; sometimes the fisher; sometimes a physician; and why not presented so as well to the eye as to the ear. Before the knowledge of letters God was known by Hierogliphickes; and, indeed, what are the heavens, the earth, nay every creature, but hieroglyphics and emblems of his glory?" The second reference to the engraving as a "type" occurs in Emblem VII (p. 30).

[83] Two small collections appeared between Whitney's Choice (1568) and Peacham's Minerva Britanna (1612). The first, The Heroical Devises of M. Claudius Paradin (1591), by a certain "S. P.," is a catalogue of heraldry, translated from Paradin's Devises Heroiques (Lyons: 1551); the second, published c. 1600, is Francis Thynne's Emblemes and Epigrames, ed. F. J. Furnivall (London: 1876). Like

---

Willet's Sacrorum, Thynne's emblems were published without illustrations. Miss Freeman is incorrect, however, when she asserts that "the kind of virtue inculcated . . . suggest[s] the values of the Puritan middle class" (p. 68). Thynne's epigrams, from a Puritan point of view at any rate, would be characterized as "lewd" and "indecent" (see, for example, "A tench and a wench," "Drinkinge," and particularly "A Rose-- ". . . thow canst not bee without a rose in thy bedd, / to colle the, and to laye her arme under thy hedd"). Moreover, two epigrams are explicitly anti-Puritan ("A preist whiche knewe not anie letter," and "A Puritane": "Dame Lais is a puritane by religion, / Impure in her deedes, though puer in her talke . . .").

In George Wither's A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne (London: 1635) most of the plates are taken from an Italian emblem book and, in its choice of subjects, it is quite similar to Whitney's book, the plates in many cases being identical to the ones Whitney took from Alciati. On the other hand, Wither's interpretations only occasionally reflect the classical influence; in this sense, his book is closer to Quarles's work. Although there are no types in the 200 emblems, one traditional medieval allegory does appear; the plate is quite different from the other engravings in the book. In Emblem XX (Book 3), Wither presents in the foreground a pelican piercing its breast; the blood flows out into the mouths of the small birds. In the background, Christ is pictured on the cross; the blood from his side flows out in several streams into goblets held up by those at the foot of the cross. The emblem is headed by an explanatory couplet: "Our Pelican, by bleeding, thus, / Fulfill'd the Law, and cured US." His verse makes quite clear that he is aware of the medieval allegorical interpretation:

> ". . . To be their Food, himself he freely gave;
> His Heart was pierc'd, that he their Soules might save.
> Because, they disobey'd the Sacred will,
> He, did the Law of Righteousness fulfill;
> And, to that end (though guiltlesse he had bin);
> Was offred, for our Universall sinne . . ." (p. 154).

Finally, there are several Jesuit emblem books which were printed in the first decades of the seventeenth typology and the pictorial aspects of medieval allegory can be seen. By the end of the seventeenth century, even they had almost disappeared, for when the

> interests, first of the learned, and then of the ordinary reader, shifted away from all that had encouraged and strengthened a liking for the allegorical aspect of things, the emblem book became . . . a trivial and rather childish mode of expression. . . .[84]

The last important emblem collection is A Book for Boys and Girls: Or Country Rhymes for Children (London: 1686), published by John Bunyan. There are no traces in it of typology or medieval allegory.

It is difficult to say precisely why typology and medieval allegory, particularly in relation to visual representation, disappear. One reason, certainly, is related to the revival of classical learning. Typology, except for the Greek traditions underlying the New Testament, has no relevance to classical images; for typology in its

---

century. At least one of these, Typus Mundi (1627), influenced Quarles, particularly in the devotional aspects of his poetry. Most of his engravings are derivative; it is obvious, however, that whatever Quarles borrowed from the Jesuits retained little of the specific qualities of Catholic literature. For a detailed discussion of Quarles's relationship to the Jesuit literature, see Freeman, pp. 115ff., and Chap. 7, "Catholic Emblem Books in Prose"; for a discussion of the sources of Quarles's engravings, see Gordon S. Haight, "The Sources of Quarles's Emblems," The Library, Fourth Series (September, 1934), XVI, 188ff.

[84] Freeman, p. 204.

strictest sense relies upon historical correspondences between the Hebrew faith and the experiences of the early Christian church. From the beginning, however, medieval allegory had been based upon the Hellenistic allegorical principles associated with the School of Alexandria. Although medieval theologians were wary of secular learning, such classical figures as Hercules and such classical myths as the legend of the Phoenix were viewed as types of Christ as early as the fourth century; moreover, allegorical personifications of such abstractions as the Virtues and Vices were widely represented as early as the eleventh century. Yet, even with these close relationships to classical thought, allegorical interpretations in the seventeenth century are rarely based on the large body of medieval imagery. The reaction of the Roman Church to the Protestant Reformation no doubt had something to do with the decline of medieval imagery, for one of the central criticisms of the reformers was the extravagances of medieval theologians. In one sense, perhaps, Catholics over-reacted to Protestant attacks; even in the Jesuit emblem books, for example, the basis for the allegorical interpretations is primarily classical, not medieval. Perhaps the Renaissance shift in emphasis from the other world to this world also partially accounts for the changes. Such a view, however, does not explain the Puritans' position;

Puritans never forgot the difference between being in the world but not of it; and when the Old World did not suffice, they turned to the New one. Although they smashed the stained glass windows at Canterbury, they accepted Quarles's "graven images" with little reservation, for Quarles pictured the world as the Puritans knew it. Moreover, unlike the allegorical typology of the Middle Ages, which the Puritans emphatically rejected, Quarles's allegory was not theological, nor was it typological. Besides, the Puritans had already begun to re-establish and re-enact the central myth of typology: in 1620 William Guild published Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows of the Old Testament Opened and Explained; in the same year, the Pilgrims began the Exodus; and ten years later, John Winthrop started for the Wilderness.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PURITAN TYPOLOGY

Because of its close relation to prophecy, typology in the works of New Testament authors is considered a part of the literal sense of scripture, in so far as the New Testament authors distinguished among different senses. Prophecy necessarily involves, of course, a dual aspect: a predictive statement within the framework of Hebrew revelation, and its fulfillment in the work of Christ. In either case, however, both aspects are historically verifiable. When Jeremiah predicts that God "will make a new covenant with the house of Israel" (31: 13), for example, his person and message exist within the historical context of the experiences of the Jewish nation; when the author of The Epistle to the Hebrews cites the prophecy of Jeremiah and affirms that Christ "is the mediator of a better covenant" (8: 6), he testifies to the consummation of the Hebrew prophet's message in the person of Christ. Hence, types are a part of the literal, historical aspect of Jewish and Christian experiences. On the other hand, as pointed out in Chapter II, typical identifications, even those explicitly stated by Christ, inevitably involve the purpose and personality of the interpreter. This subjectivism is of relatively little consequence in the canonical authors of the New Testament because they are limited to a body of scripture whose meaning, through centuries of interpretation, had been codified in the Talmudic commentaries. Moreover, their audience, particularly in the books and epistles most typologically oriented, is Jewish; what was considered prophetic in the Hebrew faith was transferred to the typologic in the kerygma, Gospels, and Epistles.

As the final New Testament canon became widely acknowledged, however, the problem of typical identification became much more complex; for part of the burden of the evolving Church Tradition was to identify and make explicit what was only implicit in the New Testament: the process was from the New Testament canon to Canon Law. When, in Matthew's Gospel, Christ says "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly . . . so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (12: 40), the typical identification is unmistakable: Christ's descent into the grave is the antitype of Jonah's "descent" into the whale.[1] On the other hand, such explicit identifications are relatively few; the majority, even for the authors of the New Testament, are based on less precise parallels.[2] St. Peter's identification of Noah's ark with the sacrament of baptism is not as exact as the analogy between Jonah and Christ:

---

[1] In medieval representations of Christ's descent into the grave, and secondarily his visit to the "spirits in prison," the "jaws" of death are invariably represented as the open mouth of a great fish, consciously extending the Jonah-whale motif. See, for example, *Biblia pauperum*, ed. H. Th. Musper (Munich: 1961), p. 38; and Bernard

> . . . God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ . . . (I Peter 4: 19-20).

There are certain obvious parallels in this identification: as Noah was saved from destruction so is the baptismal candidate saved from sin; God miraculously preserved

---

Rackham, "East Window of Corona," The Ancient Glass of Canterbury Cathedral (London: 1949), pp. 76-77.

[2] As this chapter will make clear, the compilation of a list of biblical types is an impossibility; for such a list, from the standpoint of Augustine's "analogy of faith" or the Puritans' "express scriptural warrant," involves in every case the predispositions and theological commitments of the compiler. The anonymous author of Pictor in Carmine lists 508 acceptable types (see Montague R. James, Archaeologia, 2nd. Series [1951], XCIV, 141-166); Samuel Mather accepts approximately 300 (see The Figures or Types of the Old Testament [London: 1705], especially the Index); and Patrick Fairbairn admits of approximately 70 (see The Typology of Scripture, or The Doctrine of Types [Edinburgh: 1845-47]). The author of Pictor represents the extent to which allegorical typology dominated the mind of the twelfth century; Mather's work is the most detailed of any Puritan study; and Fairbairn's relatively modest identifications reflect the unfavorable reaction to typological excesses from the point of view of nineteenth century theologians.

Noah, and Christ's miracle is reflected in the sacrament of baptism. On the other hand, certain discrepancies are involved, and several aspects of the original identification are not explained. Noah and his family are not saved by water, but from water; eight souls were saved from the flood, while the sacrament is personal and individual. In the typological interpretations of the early Fathers, however, such apparent discrepancies are resolved, and each aspect of the typical relationship is explained. By the latter part of the second century, for example, Justin Martyr had developed the following interpretation of the typical identification of St. Peter:

> . . . God said . . . that the mystery of saved men appeared in the deluge. For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge, i.e., with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when He rose from the dead. . . . For Christ, being the first-born of every creature, became again the chief of another race regenerated by Himself through water, and faith, and wood, containing the mystery of the cross; even as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters with his household. . . . I mean, that by water, faith, and wood, those who are afore-prepared, and who repent of the sins which they have committed, shall escape from the impending judgment of God.[3]

---

[3] Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho," The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1956), I, 268. For a complete discussion of the relation of the Noah account to early baptismal typology, see Per Lundberg, La Typologie baptismal de l'ancienne église, Acta Seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis (Leipzig: 1942), X, 10ff. Jean

According to this interpretation, Noah prefigures Christ as the head of a new humanity, the eight mortals saved typically present the resurrection, the wood of the ark typifies the wood of the Cross, and so on. The explicit identifications of Peter's epistle are retained, of course, but the major focus of Justin Martyr's interpretation is upon the implied relationships; subsequently, his reading will be extended by Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and others, entering into the mainstream of Patristic exegesis and becoming an irrevocable part of Canon Law.

In this process, and in the codification of the four-fold level of interpretation, typology is allotted an increasingly minor role. Generally speaking, the type-antitype construct is identified with the literal sense, thereby subordinating it to the tropological, allegorical, and anagogical readings. Moreover, allegorical readings, based on Alexandrian precepts, dominate medieval exegesis, further limiting the use of types. Quite often the type provides only the original identification and has little relationship to the extensive allegorical interpretations; in Origen's allegory of the dimensions of the ark, for

---

Daniélou focuses primarily upon the Alexandrian Fathers in "The Flood, Baptism, and Judgement in the Fathers of the Church," From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers (Westminster, Maryland: 1960), pp. 85-112.

example, typology is involved only as a point of departure:

> . . . The numbers introduced are sixfold, as 300 is 6 times 50; and tenfold, as 300 is 10 times 30; and containing one and two-thirds, for 50 is one and two-thirds of 30. Now there are some who say that 300 cubits are symbols of the Lord's sign; and 50, of hope and of the remission given at Pentecost; and 30, or as in some manuscripts 12, they say, points out the preaching of the Gospel, because the Lord preached in his 30th year, and the Apostles were 12. And the structure terminating in a cubit is the symbol of the advancement of the righteous to oneness, and the unity of the faith.[4]

Such interpretations became a part of the corpus of Church Tradition; as such they were essential to an orthodox understanding of scripture. By the end of the fourteenth century, Catholic theologians, reacting to the increasing disenchantment within the Church itself, dogmatically assert that Tradition is not simply co-equal with scripture, but superior to it. In his indictment of the doctrines of Wycliffe, for example, William of Waterford declares that "many things we are bound to believe and to do . . . cannot be deduced from Sacred Scripture alone." Doctrines can be, and are, rooted in "apostolic institutions confirmed by tradition."[5]

---

[4] Cited in Daniélou, p. 104.

[5] Cited in George H. Tavard, Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation (New York: 1959), p. 43. Tavard, a Catholic theologian, characterizes the conflict between the Reformers and the Church as a choice between "Holy Writ or Holy Church." He asserts that the "crisis of the Protestant Reformation

Before Puritan typology could develop, therefore, it was necessary to re-establish the primacy of the literal sense, eliminating the accrued interpretations of Patristic allegory which were a major part of Church Tradition. The rehabilitation of New Testament typology was, perhaps, only a byproduct of the more central concerns of the Reformation. Yet, when the Reformers denied the validity of the Church and its councils, when they insisted on a faith founded upon *Scriptura sacra* alone, and when the vernacular translations of the Bible which were deemed necessary to the Protestant cause led interpreters back to the original Greek and Hebrew texts, it was inevitable that typological interpretations would find their way into the Reformers' treatises. Moreover, once the New Testament distinction between typology and Alexandrian allegory had been re-established, for a brief time typology became almost as important a method of biblical exegesis as

---

hinged around two main points . . . : justification by faith and Scripture alone" (p. vii). Concerning Waterford's statements, Tavard notes that "there can hardly be a more striking instance of the extent to which the fourteenth century contributed to bring about a collapse of the medieval synthesis" (p. 43) between Tradition and Scripture. The Reformers did not, of course, share the same views toward the Bible; doctrinal differences and theological emphases created different approaches to scriptural interpretation. On the other hand, all of the Reformers agreed on one principle: *Ad fontes*--"Back to the sources."

medieval allegory had been to the Scholastics.[6] The

---

[6] Victor Harris suggests that the emphasis on typology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was "an attempt to retain the literal without restricting it to the 'letter'"; he also notes that "types could serve the ends of allegory [and that] they were sometimes substituted for allegory and sometimes identified with it" ("Allegory to Analogy in the Interpretation of Scriptures,"*Philological Quarterly* [January, 1966] XLV, 2). Harris fails to distinguish clearly between "medieval" allegory and "biblical" allegory, something the Puritans never failed to do. It is true that the Puritans--and the Reformers--rejected Patristic allegorizing; it is also true, however, that they recognized allegory as an acceptable method of figurative interpretation based upon biblical precedent. As Samuel Mather points out, it is not necessary "to the Nature of an Allegory, that it be always *Res ficta*: God, who is the Author of all the Arts . . . hath set no such Rule in the Art of Rhetoric. . . . For *Abraham* and *Sarah*, and *Isaac*, and *Hagar* and *Ishmael*, is a *real History*; yet the *Apostle* affirmeth, That it is an Allegory," Gal. 4 (p. 128). Allegory had a legitimate place in biblical interpretation; no Puritan, for example, attempted to interpret literally the Book of Canticles. Yet Puritans insisted, as did the Reformers, that those scriptural passages which necessitate allegorical interpretations are relatively few; the Church Fathers are condemned for failing to make this distinction. According to Mather (quoting Luther), such interpretations are *Spumam Scripturae*, "they beat the Scriptures into Froth by allegorizing all things" (p. 130).

Unfortunately, Perry Miller also fails to make this distinction; as Sacvan Bercovitch points out, Miller's analysis of typology in relation to the Cotton-Williams controversy is "patently wrong in several essentials" ("Typology in Puritan New England: The Williams-Cotton Controversy Reassessed," *American Quarterly* [Summer, 1967], XIX, 168). Miller asserts that the "great Protestant reformers had been very explicit in their condemnation of the typological method. . . ," that Luther called "allegory and the scheme of types a 'harlot' seducing 'idle' men . . . ," and that the "English Reformers . . . were furiously hostile to all typological speculations" (*Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition* [New York: 1953], pp. 34-35). As this chapter indicates, each of these statements is demonstrably incorrect. Hence, Puritans, for example, base their defense of covenant theology primarily upon typological exegesis.[7] It is the

---

Miller's analysis of the Cotton-Williams controversy is, as Bercovitch points out, mistaken; further, the same errors, as I point out in Chapter IV, invalidate his analysis of Jonathan Edwards' use of typology in *Images or Shadows of Divine Things* (New Haven: 1948), pp. 5ff.

The same mistake is also made by Charles Feidelson, Jr. in *Symbolism and American Literature* (Chicago: 1953). After discussing the four-fold method in Medieval Catholicism and commenting on Aquinas' statements concerning the principle of *multiplex intelligentia*, Feidelson asserts that "the Puritans gingerly preserved this Catholic tradition as the science of 'typology'" (p. 88). Even without a knowledge of the origins and early development of typology, one wonders why literary critics have failed to distinguish between medieval allegory and the Puritan practice of typology, for every Puritan typological study goes to great lengths to distinguish between the two different modes. Moreover, biblical critics have recognized and insisted on distinguishing between the two for over a century.

On the other hand, Ursula Brumm briefly notes that typology is an acceptable method of exegesis to both Luther and Calvin: ". . . Luther accepted typology, however, rejecting the four-fold scriptural meaning as nonsense. Typology . . . has found limited application with Calvin, and was renewed by the Calvinists of the seventeenth century" (*Die Religiöse Typologie im Amerikanischen Denken* [Leiden: 1963], p. 25). Miss Brumm does not discuss in any extensive way the development of typological identifications in the Reformers. Her remarks are based primarily, as she notes, on the brief introduction in Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologia (Guttersloh: 1939), XLIII, 7ff. As my discussion in this chapter indicates, Calvin's "limited application" of typology is much more extensive than has been supposed.

[7] In medieval allegory, for example, Abraham is subordinated to the significance of Isaac as a type of Christ in the sacrifice. In the *Biblia Pauperum*, Christ carrying the Cross is presented in the central panel of the

purpose of this chapter, then, to trace briefly the relation of typology to the developing insistence on the superiority of the literal sense, to indicate the place of typology in the exegesis of Tyndale, Luther, and Calvin, and to analyze the major Protestant typological studies of the seventeenth century.

Protestant reformers were by no means the first exegetes to insist on the superiority of the literal sense of the Scriptures. As has been discussed in Chapter I,[8] in the first decade of the fourth century the School of Antioch was founded in direct and explicit opposition to

---

triptych; Isaac bearing the bundle of sticks (shaped like a cross) is represented in the left panel as the prefiguration of the Crucifixion. Like Christ, Isaac was an only son offered in willing sacrifice by his father. Such parallels were first developed by St. Ambrose (*Isaac ergo Christi passuri est typus*), although they had been briefly identified by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen (see Alison Moore Smith, "The Iconography of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Early Christian Art," *American Journal of Archaeology*, 2nd Series [1922], XXVI, 159ff.; and Rosemary Woolf, "The Effect of Typology on the English Mediaeval Plays of Abraham and Isaac," *Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies* [October, 1957], XXXII, 805-825).

On the other hand, Samuel Mather identifies Abraham as a type of Christ, admitting, however, that "he is omitted by divers that have handled this subject." Mather acknowledges that Isaac may be viewed as prefiguring Christ, but he focuses primarily on the covenant relationship established in Abraham: "If we consider *Abraham* as the *Head of the Covenant to that Church and People*: So he is a Type of *Christ*, the Head of the second Covenant" (p. 82).

[8] See above, pp. 112ff.

the allegorical principles of the School of Alexandria. St. Hilory expressly condemns the subordination of the literal sense to allegorical renderings: "The best reader is he who looks for the meaning of the words in themselves . . . and does not insist that the words signify what he presupposed before reading them."[9] St. Basil, in his commentaries on Genesis, makes clear that Alexandrian allegory is a distortion of the true sense of scripture:

> I know the laws of allegory, though not from my own works but from the works of others. Some preachers do not concede the ordinary sense of the Scriptures. They will not call water water, but something else. They interpret a plant or fish as their fancy wishes. They change the nature of the reptiles and wild beasts to fit their allegories, like those who explain . . . dreams to suit their own ends. When I hear the word grass, I understand that grass is meant.[10]

And St. John Chrysostom, the last of the Antiochene exegetes, insists that types are one aspect of the literal sense; moreover, from Chrysostom's point of view, "types were the exception, not the rule; the Incarnation was everywhere prepared, but not everywhere prefigured."[11]

---

[9] The Trinity, trans. by S. McKenna (New York: 1954), p. 18.

[10] Cited in Johannes Quasten, Patrology: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature (Westminster, Maryland: 1960), III, 217. St. Basil, it will be remembered, was a member of the Council which condemned Origen as an heretic.

[11] As summarized in Quasten, II, 121. See also above, pp. 121ff.

Although Alexandrian allegorical principles prevailed throughout the Middle Ages, even during the twelfth century at the height of medieval Scholasticism an influential school of interpretation, following certain principles enunciated by Hugh of St. Victor, developed within the framework of the Church.[12]

Hugh severely condemns the neglect of the literal meaning of scripture; his exegetical principles are those of the School of Antioch, and he stands in direct opposition to allegorical interpretation, allowing such a reading only if the text requires it. Even then, Hugh insists that in any case no "spiritual" interpretation is to be offered without first understanding the literal meaning of the text. Hugh's exegetical principles are presented in his major theological work, _De Scripturis_. According to Hugh, as Smalley notes, scriptural exposition involves three things:

> the letter, that is the actual words, their construction and syntax, which sometimes leaves nothing to be explained; the sense, which is what the divine writer means: a mere grammatical explanation of the words does not always suffice for this, since the writer may be expressing himself in an unusual or allusive way; lastly, the sentence, which is the deep meaning to be derived from the letter or the sense (p. 94).

---

[12] For a complete discussion of Hugh of St. Victor and the Victorines, see Beryl Smalley, _The Study of The Bible in the Middle Ages_ (Oxford: 1952), pp. 83-195. My discussion of the Victorines is a brief summary of Miss Smalley's work.

Hugh insists that the "deep meaning" is based on, and must be derived from, the literal sense; further, he warns exegetes not to hurry over the literal sense in their haste to reach the mystery:

> The mystical sense is only gathered from what the letter says. . . . I wonder how people have the face to boast themselves teachers of allegory, when they do not know the primary meaning of the letter. "We read the Scriptures", they say, "but we don't read the letter. The Letter does not interest us. We teach allegory." How do you read Scripture then, if you don't read the letter? Subtract the letter and what is left?[13]

Origen, Augustine, and other Fathers of the Church, had justified allegorical interpretation on the basis of St. Paul's statement that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life"; further, the Fathers, following Origen's concept of "graduated" levels, had relegated the literal sense to the relatively simple capacities of the uneducated. Hugh insists, however, that interpreters must not make the text "*the letter killeth* an excuse for preferring our own ideas to the divine authors'"; further, to despise the literal sense is to despise all of *Scriptura sacra*:

> . . . Do not despise what is lowly in God's word, for by lowliness you will be enlightened to divinity. The outward form of God's word seems to you, perhaps, like dirt, so you trample it underfoot, like dirt, and despise what the letter tells you was done physically and visibly. But hear! that dirt, which you trample, opened the eyes of

---

[13] *De Scripturis*, V, 13-15, cited in Smalley, p. 93.

> the blind. Read Scripture then, and first learn carefully what it tells you was done in the flesh (p. 94).

Although the accents of the Reformers are clearly heard in Hugh's statements, he is not, of course, a reformer in the Protestant sense. His insistence on the literal sense is characteristically Protestant; he acknowledges, however, the authority of Church Tradition:

> When we read the holy books, let us . . . choose, from the great multitude of patristic explanations, which are drawn from few words . . . , and corroborated by the Catholic faith, that which appears to have been certainly intended by the author. If this is uncertain, let us choose at least that explanation which is admissible in the context, and is consonant with the faith. If the context does not help us, then we must choose only that prescribed by the faith . . . (p. 95).

In the end result, however, and as Hugh's practice demonstrates, when careful attention is paid to the literal meaning, the "great multitude of patristic explanations" becomes somewhat irrelevant. Stephen Langton, Hugh's contemporary, tells of a man who questioned the allegorical interpretation of the red color of the heifer (which the Law prescribed for sacrifice) as a prefiguration of the Passion. The "heretic" said that "it would be all the same if the cow had been black; the allegory is worthless; whatever the colour of the cow, some sort of allegory could be found for it." Langton mentions the man as an heretical example who needed no refutation;[14] Hugh's insistence on the importance of the literal sense is the theological counterpart to the "heretic's" dissatisfaction with the allegory of the cow.

There are numerous exegetes within the framework of the Church whose insistence on the literal sense helped to create a climate in which the Reformation could develop and flourish; many, if not most, had no intention of severing themselves from the Church; few, if any (at least in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), could conceive of a religious structure apart from the doctrines of the Roman Church, although some, such as Wycliffe, envisioned a national church politically independent of the dominance of Rome. In addition to the work of men who were basically theologians, however, there were several other movements which were harbingers of reform: the schism created by continual succession of rival popes (1378-1429) caused leaders within the Church to assemble reforming councils, culminating in the work of the Council of Trent in 1545; the wider dissemination of Greek and Hebrew manuscripts and the renaissance of the study of classical languages contributed to the philological work of men like Reuchlin and Erasmus; and such pietistic movements as the *Devotio Moderna*, which produced the influential *Imitation of Christ* and numerous devotional manuals in the vernacular--all of these influences which developed within the framework of the Church itself contributed in substantial ways to the Reformers' "return to the sources."[15] And, in a general way, all of these influences are reflected in the work of William Tyndale, whose principles of biblical interpretation and translation of the New Testament mark the beginning of the separation of typology from Patristic allegory.

---

[14] Cited in Beryl Smalley, "Stephen Langton and the Four Senses of Scripture," Speculum, No. 1 (1931), VI, 75.

---

[15] Tavard presents an excellent summary of the various exegetical movements which preceded and contributed to the Reformation (see especially "Seeds of Discord," pp. 22ff.); the same material, though less specifically related to the reaffirmation of the literal sense, is presented in Smalley, *The Study of The Bible in the Middle Ages*. For a general view of the developments within the Church which contributed to the Reformation, see Albert Hyma, *Renaissance to Reformation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1951). For an analysis of "pre-reformers" in Germany, see C. Ullmann, *Reformers Before the Reformation, Principally in Germany and the Netherlands*, trans. Robert Menzies (Edinburgh: 1855), 2 vols.; William A. Clebsch presents a detailed study of *England's Earliest Protestants: 1520-1535* (New Haven: 1964), particularly in relation to the political maneuverings of Henry VIII; and Hyma has a brief but excellent chapter on "Reformers Before the Reformation in France" (pp. 337ff.). For Wycliffe's attacks on the political authority of Rome, see *The English Works of Wyclif*, ed. F. D. Matthew (London: 1880), especially the tracts "Of Dominion" (pp. 282ff.) and "De Papa" (pp. 458 ff.). The philological contributions of Reuchlin and Erasmus are analyzed in W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background* (Cambridge: 1955). Finally, Roland H. Bainton briefly describes various pietistic movements, including the *Devotio Moderna*, in *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (London: 1953); and Hyma presents an analysis of the relation of Thomas à Kempis to the Brethren of the Common Life (pp. 124ff.).

In assessing the role which typology plays in the works of the Reformers, Perry Miller asserts that "the great Protestant reformers had been very explicit in the condemnation of the typological method along with every other variant of the allegorical." Moreover, he continues, "the English Reformers . . . were furiously hostile to all typological speculations." As an example of this "hostility," Miller cites Tyndale's statement in The Obedience of a Christian Man: "Such allegory proveth nothing, it is a mere simile. God is a Spirit, and all His words are spiritual, and his literal sense is spiritual."[16] Miller's statements are incorrect and his citation of what he takes to be Tyndale's exegetical principles is misleading; for unlike Miller, Tyndale clearly distinguishes between Patristic allegory and typology, accepting the typology of the New Testament, and recognizing the use of allegory in the Scriptures themselves and in the interpretation of certain passages. Moreover, these distinctions occur in the same context as Miller's citation, as well as in Tyndale's numerous prefaces to his translations and in other essays.

---

[16] Perry Miller, Roger Williams, pp. 36-37. Miller's citation from The Obedience is incorrect; the first sentence ("Such allegory proveth nothing, it is a mere simile") does not occur in the same context as the second, but two pages earlier in relation to a fictitious allegory which Tyndale presents as an example of the methods of Patristic allegorizing. See The Work of William Tyndale, ed. G. E. Duffield, The Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics (Appleford, Berkshire: 1964), I, 345. All citations refer to this edition.

In *The Obedience of a Christian Man* Tyndale attacks Origen as the source of the allegorical interpretations which found their way into the *glossia* of the Middle Ages. In such medieval glosses as the *Glossa Ordinaria*, for example, the biblical text occupies a relatively minor portion of any single page; each book begins with a prologue (or prologues) and other prefatory matter, and the text itself is glossed in the margins and between the lines, the gloss often extending to additional pages.[17] These annotations were taken originally from the Greek and early Latin Fathers, but each century added glosses from the leading scholastics. By the fifteenth century, from Tyndale's point of view at any rate, the allegorizing of the Fathers as represented in the glosses had obscured and distorted the scriptural text itself:

> . . . The greatest cause of . . . captivity and the decay of the faith, and this blindness wherein we now are, sprang first of allegories. For

---

[17] For a discussion of the evolution of the *glossia*, see Smalley, *The Study of The Bible in the Middle Ages*, pp. 46-66. Smalley reproduces (p. 57) a sample gloss on John's Gospel.

> Origen and the doctors of his time drew all the scripture unto allegories: whose ensample they that came after followed so long, till they at last forgot the order and process of the text, supposing that the scripture served but to feign allegories upon; insomuch that twenty doctors expound one text twenty ways. . . . Then came our sophisters with their anagogical and chopological sense, and with an antitheme of half an inch, out of which some of them draw a thread of nine days long (p. 343).

In contrast to indiscriminate allegorizing, Tyndale insists that because "allegories prove nothing . . . they are to be used soberly and seldom, and only where the text offereth thee an allegory" (p. 343). As he makes clear, allegories divorced from the literal sense do not prove anything; when they are justified by the literal sense, however, when allegories alone are not presented as a sole basis for doctrinal proof, then "doth the literal sense prove the allegory, and bear it, as the foundation beareth the house" (p. 343). Therefore, all interpretations--including typological and allegorical interpretations--arise from the literal sense and are proved by it. As an example of the legitimate extension of the text, Tyndale interprets the same scripture which the Fathers had used as a justification for multiple interpretations: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Tyndale asserts that "the letter signifieth not the literal sense, and the spirit not the spiritual sense," for in this passage "Paul maketh a comparison between the law and the gospel; and calleth the law the letter, because it was but letters graven in two tablets of cold stone. . . ." The gospel, Tyndale notes, is the "administration of the Spirit and of righteousness or justifying" (p. 344). It is in this context then that Tyndale asserts "God is a Spirit, and all his words are spiritual." Contrary to Miller's assertion, Tyndale does not attack allegory *per se*; he attacks the allegorizing of the Church Fathers which discards the literal sense in favor of a "spiritual" reading. In the "Prologue to the Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John," Tyndale returns to the same theme, the "abuse [of] the text of Paul saying, 'The letter killeth' . . .":

> . . . we were mad to believe that [that] which hath lien fifteen hundred years, as ye say, in your rotten maws, should now be wholesome for us; ye have chewed and mingled it with your poison spittle. Can ye bear us in hand, and persuade us, think ye, with your sophistry, to believe that ye should minister your secret traditions without ground truly, when we see you minister the open scripture falsely? . . . Nay, it is an hundred times more likely that ye should be falser in secret things than in open. . . . And as we restore the scripture unto her right understanding from your false glosses, even so deliver we the sacraments and ceremonies unto their right use from your abuse.[18]

---

[18] "Prologue to the Exposition of the First Epistle of Saint John," p. 175. Tyndale is by no means extreme in his comments; numerous critics within the Church make the same accusations. Cornelius Grapheus, a close friend of Erasmus, published a similar attack in 1522, six years before Tyndale's *The Obedience*: ". . . We have declined from Christ to Moses, and backslidden from Moses to Pharaoh. . . . We have despised the easy yoke and light burden of

Immediately following his attack in The Obedience on patristic allegorizing, Tyndale illustrates in what manner a text may be properly allegorized. He discusses the literal sense of the Old Testament account of Noah's drunkenness and Ham's jeering at his father. The literal text, according to Tyndale, "offers us an apt and handsome allegory or similitude to describe our wicked Ham, antichrist the pope. . . ." The pope has done in "many hundred years" much more shame than Ham:

> . . . And as the cursed children of Ham grew into giants, so mighty and great that the children of Israel seemed but grasshoppers in respect of them; so the cursed sons of our Ham, the pope, his cardinals, bishops, abbots, monks, and friars, are become mighty giants above all power and authority . . . (p. 347).

As the context makes clear, in presenting his allegorical interpretation Tyndale is not being ironic; from his point of view, Ham, who jeered at Noah's nakedness, is a perfect "similitude" of the Church and its hierarchy which jeers at the "naked" or literal sense.

Christ, and have betaken ourselves to the heavy load of human ordinances, giving attention to lying spirits and not believing the Gospel, distrusting the surest promises of the Saviour, but trusting in human fables. In place of the Gospel, we have adopted the decrees of the Pope, in place of Jesus, a certain Aristotle, in place of piety, ceremonies, and in place of truth, falsehood. . . . Once we were called disciples of Christ, now we are scholars of Aristotle, of Aquinas, of Scotus, and of Albert" (Ullmann, I, 138).

Neither in The Obedience nor in any other work does Tyndale condemn allegory itself, but the use to which allegory had been put in the Church Fathers; his condemnations invariably appear in relation to the glossia in general or to some specific scholastic.[19] Moreover, it is in The Obedience that Tyndale makes clear that allegories and "similitudes" are to be used when "we preach, [or] when we expound the scripture." Only the literal text may be used as doctrinal proof, but figurative language leads to a clearer understanding of the literal sense:

---

[19] See for example the prologue to his translation of the New Testament called "A Pathway into the Holy Scripture": ". . . our great pillars of holy church . . . have nailed a veil of false glosses on Moses's face" (p. 24); the preface to Genesis: ". . . in times past [they] were wont to look on no more scripture than they found in their Duns . . ." (p. 31); the preface to Jonah where glosses are called "juggling hypocrisy" and "juggling allegories" (pp. 86, 89) and the reader is urged to "first seek out the law that God will have thee to do, interpreting it spiritually, without gloss or covering the brightness of Moses's face . . ." (p. 99); the prologue to the Gospel of Matthew: the commentators' "perpetual study is to blind the scripture with glosses . . ." (p. 105); the prologue to the Epistle to the Romans: ". . . Where God's word is not purely preached, but Men's dreams, traditions, imaginations, inventions, ceremonies, and superstition, there is no faith . . ." (p. 135); the prologue to the First Epistle of St. John: the Scriptures are corrupted with a "leaven of false glosses . . ." (p. 173); and the prologue to the Exposition of Matthew V, VI, VII: ". . . by such glosses . . . have we Christians lost Christ . . ." (p. 183). Tyndale's favorite image for the effect of the glosses seems to be that of the leaven which puffs up the meal to no substance: "Take heed to thy preacher therefore, and be sure, if he be covetous and gape for promotion, that he is a false prophet and leaveneth the scripture, for all his crying, 'fathers, fathers,' 'holy church,' and 'fifteen hundred years,' and for all his other holy pretences" (pp. 195-196). Tyndale's remedy for the corrupt allegories of the glosses is: ". . . get thee to God's word, and thereby try all doctrine . . ." (p. 360). For his most sustained attack on the glosses, see The Obedience, pp. 360ff.

> . . . similitudes prove nothing, but are made to express more plainly that which is contained in scripture, and to lead thee into the spiritual understanding of the text: as the similitude of matrimony is taken to express the marriage that is between Christ and our souls, and what exceeding mercy we have there, whereof all the scriptures make mention. . . . That preacher therefore, that bringeth a naked similitude to prove that which is contained in no text of scripture, nor followeth of a text, count a deceiver . . . (p. 348).

Yet, Tyndale clearly distinguishes between the allegories of men and those contained in the Scripture; to understand scriptural allegories is to understand the literal sense even though it is phrased in figurative language:

> Thou shalt understand . . . that the scripture hath but one sense, which is the literal. And that literal sense is the root and ground of all, and the anchor that never faileth, whereunto if thou cleave, thou canst never err or go out of the way. And if thou leave the literal sense, thou canst not but go out of the way. *Neverthelater* [italics added], the scripture useth proverbs, similitudes, riddles, or allegories, as all other speeches do; but that which the proverb, similitude, riddle, or allegory signifieth, is ever the literal sense, which thou must seek out diligently: as in the English we borrow words and sentences of one thing, and apply them unto another, and give them new significations (p. 340).

Tyndale then lists more than twenty examples, largely proverbs, from current English speech to illustrate the literal meaning intended by the figurative expression. He then concludes:

> So in like manner the scripture borroweth words and sentences of all manner things, and maketh proverbs and similitudes, or allegories. As Christ saith, Luke Iv. "Physician, heal thyself:" whose interpretation is, "Do that at home, which thou dost in strange places;" and that is the literal sense. So when I say, "Christ is a lamb;" I mean not a lamb that beareth wool, but a meek and patient lamb, which is beaten for other men's faults. "Christ is a vine;" not that beareth grapes; but out of whose root the branches that believe suck the Spirit of life, and mercy, and grace, and power to be the sons of God, and to do his will. The similitudes of the gospel are allegories, borrowed of worldly matters, to express spiritual things (p. 341).

Tyndale's position has been cited at length, for his views are generally the views of Luther, Calvin, and the Puritans: Patristic or Alexandrian allegory is the foolishness of men; some texts, however, necessitate an allegorical reading; although figurative, allegory elucidates the literal sense; moreover, scripture itself utilizes similitudes and allegories to clarify the literal sense; hence, similitudes (allegories) express the spiritual sense. And to Tyndale, types are similitudes.

Neither in his translations nor the prefaces added later does Tyndale use the term _type_ (_typos_) or any of its cognates; because of the close relationship between typology and medieval allegory it seems clear that Tyndale wished to avoid any of the medieval connotations associated with a theory of types. Tyndale also avoids the use of the anglicized Latin _figura_ for the same reasons; the term *figure* appears only once in his translations and then in relation to the statues of idols in heathen temples.[20] Tyndale's avoidance of *type* and *figure* is not unusual, however, for, with only two exceptions, none of the sixteenth and seventeenth century Protestant versions uses either term.[21] On the other hand, the Rheims authorized

---

[20] My analysis of Tyndale's translations is based upon the Greek text of Scholz-Griesbach as presented in *The English Hexapla, Exhibiting the Six Important English Translations of the New Testament (Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, Genevan, Anglo-Remish, Authorized)* (London: 1850), where the Greek text is presented at the top of each page and the six English versions are printed in parallel columns beneath it. The lexicon used is G. Abbott-Smith's, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: 1953). One should note, however, that the term *figura* does appear in the later polemical works (p. 452).

[21] Abbott-Smith lists fifteen uses of *typos* and its cognates. The following chart compares the English translations of each of the uses of *typos*:

Text	Wycliffe (1380)	Tyndale (1534)	Geneva (1557)
John 20:25	place	holes	print
Acts 6:45	figuirs	figures	figures
Rom 6:17	forme	forme	forme
Acts 23:25	pistil	letter	letter
Acts 7:44	fourme	fassion	fasshion
Heb 8:5	saumpler	patrone	patrone
I Cor 10:6	figure	ensample	ensample
Phil 3:17	fourme	ensample	ensample
I Thes 1:7	ensaumple	ensample	ensample
II Thes 3:9	ensaumple	insample	ensample
I Tim 4:12	ensaumple	insample	ensample
Tit 2:7	ensaumple	insample	ensample
I Pet 5:3	ensaumple	insample	ensample

Catholic version uses *figure* (and *example*) in each case where *typos* is used in the technical, typological sense.

Rom 5:14	likeness	similitude	similitude
I Cor 10:11	figure	ensample	ensample

Text	Rheims (1582)	KJV (1611)
John 20:25	place	print
Acts 6:43	figures	figures
Rom 6:17	forme	fourme
Acts 23:25	letter	letter
Acts 7:44	forme	fashion
Heb 8:5	exampler	paterne
I Cor 10:6	figure	example
Phil 3:17	forme	ensample
I Thes 1:7	paterne	ensample
II Thes 3:9	paterne	ensample
I Tim 4:12	example	example
Tit 2:7	example	paterne
I Pet 5:3	example	ensample
Rom 5:14	figure	figure
I Cor 10:11	figure	ensample

The first six uses represent various non-technical meanings: "an impression made by a stamp," "the sense or substance of a letter," and "a pattern." The next seven texts illustrate the use of Old Testament figures or events which are interpreted typologically in an ethical sense. The final two uses are related solely to the type-antitype construct.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the term *example*, in a religious sense, was taken to be synonymous with *type* and *sign*. Thomas Wilson's *A Christian Dictionary, Opening the signification of the chiefe wordes dispersed generally through Holie Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments* (London: 1611), is a standard work which presents the prevailing definitions of the period. Under *example*, he lists as a primary meaning, "A tipe or signe for us to looke upon for admonition, to be warned by it" (p. 130). Wilson cites as scriptural authority Paul's comments in I Corinthians 10: 11: "These thinges came

It is clear, however, that Tyndale uses "ensample" in eight instances as a substitute for type, using "similitude" in the only other case where typos is used in the limited typological sense.

Tyndale studiously avoids opening the way to interpreting Old Testament types by the terms of medieval allegory. In contrasting the promises of the Old Law with its fulfillment in Christ, he uses the awkward term "fore-rehearsed" to express the typical relationship between the Old and New Testaments;[22] in "A Pathway into The Holy Scripture" he also uses the phrase "promises rehearsed" in the typological sense:

> . . . When Christ is thuswise preached, and the promises rehearsed, which are contained in the prophets, in the psalms, and in divers places of the five books of Moses . . . , then the hearts of them which are elect and chosen begin to wax soft and melt at the bounteous mercy of God, and kindness showed of Christ (p. 15).

In the "Prologue to the Book of Leviticus," however, Tyndale is more direct: he explains that the rites and ceremonies of the Hebrew faith are "shadows" of the promises fulfilled in Christ; moreover, he makes explicit that these promises are expressed in "allegories, similitudes,

---

unto them for Examples." His citation is not from the KJV, but from the Geneva edition of 1557, which, except for the introductory conjunction, is identical to Tyndale's translation.

[22] Two instances occur in "A Pathway into The Holy Scripture," p. 15.

or examples":

> . . . though sacrifices and ceremonies can be no ground or foundation to build upon; that is, though we can prove nought with them, yet when once we have found out Christ and his mysteries, then we may borrow figures, that is to say allegories, similitudes, or examples, to open Christ, and the secrets of God hid in Christ. . . . For similitudes have more virtue and power with them than bare words, and lead a man's wits farther into the pith and marrow and spiritual understanding of the thing, than all the words that can be imagined (p. 60).

In relation to the prefigurations of Christ in the Old Testament, Tyndale makes clear that similitudes and examples (the two terms he uses in his translations as substitutes for type) lead one further into the "marrow of sacred divinity" than "bare words" alone. Although some types are unclear in their meaning and only "shadow forth" Christ, some are as clear as the "light of broad day":

> . . . all the ceremonies and sacrifices have, as it were, a star-light of Christ, yet some there be that have, as it were, the light of the broad day . . . and express him, and the virtue of his death so plainly, as if we should play his passion on a scaffold, or in a stage-play, openly before the eyes of the people; as the scape-goat, the brasen serpent, the ox burnt without the host, the passover lamb, &c.: insomuch that I am fully persuaded, and cannot but believe, that God had shewed Moses the secrets of Christ, and the very manner of his death beforehand. . . . And I believe also that the prophets, which followed Moses to confirm his prophecies, and to maintain his doctrine unto Christ's coming, were moved by such things to search farther of Christ's secrets. . . . As they had a general promise that one of the seed of Abraham should come and bless them, even so they had a general faith that God would by the same man save them, though they wist not by

> what means: as the very apostles, when it was oft told them, yet they could never comprehend it, till it was fulfilled in deed (p. 60).

The scapegoat, brazen serpent, and the sacrificial ox and lamb are, of course, traditional typical identifications of the Passion; as such, they testify to the typological unity of the two testaments, which, from Tyndale's point of view, was revealed to Moses, the author of the Pentateuch.

Moreover, such type-antitype identifications are not unusual in Tyndale's works, particularly when one recognizes that he often uses the term "ensample" as a substitute for type. In the prologue to Genesis, for example, Tyndale lists six Old Testament figures (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph) as "personal" types of Christ, noting that "these are ensamples written for our learning (as Paul saith), to teach us to trust in God . . ." (p. 40); while warning that "allegories" prove nothing apart from the literal sense, he identifies "circumcision . . . [as] a figure of baptism" and the "offering of Isaac . . . a figure or ensample of the resurrection" (p. 63), Noah as "an example and likeness . . . of baptism," Moses bringing water out of the rock a "figure or ensample of Christ," the "sea and the cloud [of the Exodus] a figure of baptism," the brazen serpent as a "similitude or figure" of the Crucifixion (p. 64), and so on.

In addition, Tyndale often identifies Old Testament persons and events as types of Christ without using the terms "ensample," "similitude," or "figure": Christ is Abraham's son (p. 44), Christ is Aaron and Aaron's sons (p. 64), and "Christ is the brasen serpent; on whom whosoever, being stung with the conscience of sin . . . , looketh with a sure faith, is healed immediately of that stinging, and saved from the pains and sorrows of hell" (p. 183).[23] Tyndale's use of the type-antitype construct is not as extensive as in Puritan writings of more than a century later; he stands too near to the medieval traditions of allegory to be completely at ease in his use of typology. On the other hand, one simply cannot say, with Miller, that Tyndale was "furiously hostile to all typological speculations," or that he is explicit in his "condemnation of the typological method along with every other variant of the allegorical."[24]

---

[23] There are numerous other typical identifications as well; nearly all of Tyndale's works, including *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, deal explicitly with typology. It is true that Tyndale warns against using allegory and similitudes as sole proof for matters of "faith and doctrine," but this warning must be taken in the context of his defense of the uses of allegories, similitudes, and "ensamples." Even in the prologue to Exodus (p. 50), where Tyndale appears to condemn typological identifications, his immediate qualifications make clear that he is warning against the allegorical extravagances of the Church Fathers and contemporary Catholic theologians: ". . . make not Moses a figure of Christ, *with Rochester* [that is, after the example of Fisher, Roman Catholic Bishop of Rochester]; but an ensample unto all princes, and to all that are in authority. . . . And of Aaron also see that thou make no figure of Christ, *until he come unto his sacrificing* . . ." [italics added]. The central purpose of *The Obedience* is to attack Fisher, who had compiled a list of twenty-three heresies charged against Tyndale. For a discussion of the acrimonious debate between Fisher and Tyndale, see Clebsch, pp. 148ff. Even Sir Thomas More, designated by Henry VIII to silence Tyndale, could occasionally become exasperated with the methods of the Schoolmen; on one occasion he said of them that "reading the schoolmen was like trying to milk a he-goat into a sieve" (cited in *Luther: Early Theological Works*, The Library of Christian Classics, ed. James Atkinson [Philadelphia: 1962], XVI, 262).

Tyndale's debt to Martin Luther is still a matter of some critical disagreement;[25] from the standpoint of typology, however, whether Tyndale was influenced by Luther or arrived at his limited use of typology independently is unimportant. For Luther's use of typology--and allegory--is far more extensive than Tyndale's; among the Puritans, Samuel Mather most closely approximates Luther's practice, though not, of course, his theology.[26] Luther was a Doctor of the Church; his early lectures on the book of Hebrews (1515-1517) to the divinity students at Erfurt indicate the extent to which medieval allegory influenced his approach to the Scriptures. In these lectures can be "clearly seen the young university scholar, an unknown monk teaching theology . . . , using the traditional medieval technique of gloss and scholion for the last time."[27] Luther's gloss on the scriptural passages is based primarily upon the commentaries of Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine, although he occasionally cites from the later Latin Fathers. In the second part of his lectures, the scholia, Luther utilizes the four-fold method of interpretation with an ease which demonstrates his early training and long practice. In discussing the meaning of the Old Testament sacrifices, for example, he explains the literal sense by commenting in detail upon the sacrificial procedures of the Jews; the tropological sense signifies the necessity of the "mortification of the flesh"; the allegorical sense relates the sacrifices to the Church, the body of Christ; and the anagogical sense relates to Heaven where one may offer the "sacrifice of praise" (pp. 112ff.). In these early lectures Luther also demonstrates a knowledge of the typology of the New Testament; in the book of Hebrews, of course, he could hardly avoid using the typical approach. In analyzing the author's use of image, Luther emphasizes that in Hebrews the term is not synonymous with typos, "i. e., 'schema' which properly connotes 'figura'" (p. 32); Luther insists that image refers to the actual essence of God, while the terms associated with typology refer only to the "shadow" of His presence. He identifies Melchizedek as a type of Christ (p. 133), the High Priest in the Temple as a "shadow" of Christ (p. 150), Christ's love and grace as "the realities which are signified by the figures and types of the Old Testament" (p. 178), the ceremonial washings of the sacrifices as "figurative types" of baptism (p. 196), and so on. The early Luther, still a member of the Roman Church, has clearly been molded by its hermeneutics. On the other hand, even in the "lectures on Hebrews" there are indications of Luther's later attitudes. In the last part of the lecture series, after Luther had moved to Heidelberg, the Patristic citations are used less and less as the authority for his interpretations; in discussing the Eleventh Chapter, which lists the Old Testament figures whose lives were ordered by faith in God, Luther discards Patristic authority and presents the first intimations of his later insistence on "justification by faith alone" (see pp. 211ff.). Even his citations from the Church Fathers anticipate his rejection of Alexandrian allegory: in all of the lectures he quotes only once from Origen; the majority of his citations are from the last exponent of the Antiochene School, St. Chrysostom.

---

[24] In discussing Tyndale's attitude toward typology I have limited my analysis to those works which deal specifically with principles of exegesis and translation, works published primarily before the development of Tyndale's theology of the "contract." In _A briefe declaration of the sacraments_ (London: 1548), however, "typological exegesis" is the dominant "mode of this work" (Clebsch, pp. 184-185). Tyndale supports a "Protestant" view of the presence of Christ in the elements of the Eucharist by an extensive identification of the typical precedents in the Old Testament sacrifices; he also asserts that baptism itself is simply an external figure of an inward change, in the same way that the crossing of the Red Sea, for example, is itself a figure of Christ's baptism. _A briefe declaration_ is Tyndale's clearest statement of "covenant" theology, and it is based on an elaborate series of typical identifications. Each contract which God made with man (Abraham, Noah, Jacob, etc.) is marked by an external sign; these Old Testament agreements "figure" forth the external signs associated with baptism and the eucharistic meal.

[25] For a discussion of the extent to which Tyndale was indebted to Luther, and Tyndale's subsequent disenchantment with Lutheran theology, see Clebsch, "Tyndale as Luther's Protege," pp. 137ff. Tyndale's prologue to the Epistle to the Romans, for example, is a translation of Luther's preface which appeared in 1522, four years earlier (see _The Works_, pp. 120-146).

---

[26] One hesitates to belabor Miller's inaccuracies in relation to the Reformers' use of typology; yet his comments have been widely accepted and, hence, have led to a misunderstanding of Puritan typology. According to Miller, after the disciples of Bonaventure had formulated an eightfold sense of scriptural interpretation, "Luther thought it time to call a halt and assert: 'The literal sense of Scripture alone is the whole essence of faith and of Christian theology.'" Miller continues: "Each passage, Luther declared, has one clear, definite and true sense of its own; allegories are empty speculations, 'and as it were the scum of Holy Scripture.' He called allegory and the scheme of types a 'harlot' seducing 'idle' men" (Roger Williams, p. 35). In several places Luther does insist that the literal sense contains the sum of faith; his exegetical principles, however, are not that simple. Moreover, as my discussion will indicate, his comments in relation to New Testament typology are invariably favorable; in none of Luther's work have I been able to locate a condemnation of typology as a "harlot." Miller's failure to distinguish between medieval allegory and typology accounts for part of his misreading. On the other hand, in the most obvious places Luther defends allegory, properly used, and practices typology (the Preface to the Old Testament, for example). Finally, in each of the indexes to the 53 volumes of the American edition of Luther's Works, there are numerous references to "allegory," "figure," and "type" which clearly identify explicit passages presenting Luther's use of allegory and typology. It is difficult to reconcile Miller's statements with such extensive evidence to the contrary.

---

[27] Luther: *Early Theological Works*, XVI, 13-14. All page number citations to the "Lectures on Hebrews" refer to this edition.

Twenty years later, in the "Lectures on Genesis" (1535-1536), Luther the Reformer comments on his early exegetical procedures and his predilection for allegory; his statements here are essential to understanding his "Protestant" hermeneutic principles. After presenting his interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis, Luther asserts that he has

> treated all these facts in their historical meaning, which is their real and true one. In the interpretation of Holy Scripture the main task must be to derive from it some sure and plain meaning, especially because there is such a variety of interpreters--Latin, Greek, and Hebrew too. Almost all of these not only do not concern themselves with the story but bury it and confuse it with nonsensical allegories.[28]

Luther then identifies the original sources of "nonsensical allegories": Origen and Jerome. "Everywhere," he says,

> they depart from the historical account, which they call "the letter that kills" and "the flesh"; and they bestow lofty praise on the "spiritual meaning," of which they have no actual knowledge. In fact, Jerome followed Origen as his teacher (I, 232).

---

[28] "Lectures on Genesis," Luther's Works, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis, Missouri: 1958), I, 231. Unless otherwise noted, subsequent citations to Luther's writing refer to this 53-volume edition.

As the context makes clear, Luther condemns "nonsensical allegories" which he expressly associates with the Alexandrian school of interpretation. In the same context, he characterizes the scholastic interpretations of his own time as the contemporary extension of Alexandrian allegory. He then comments upon his own earlier use of Alexandrian allegory:

> When I was a young man, my own attempts at allegory met with fair success. It was even permissible to come up with foolish ideas, since these great teachers of the churches, such as Jerome and Origen, had at times given wide range to their imagination. . . . Augustine, too, was led astray . . . , and, especially in the instance of the Psalms, he disregards the historical sense and has recourse to allegories. They were all convinced that, especially in the historical accounts of the Old Testament, the allegories represented the spiritual meaning; but the historical account itself, or the literal sense, represented the carnal meaning (I, 232).

Luther asserts, again in relation to Alexandrian allegory, that such procedures are a "desecration of the sacred writings," and he recommends that beginning students of the Scriptures read the Church Fathers with discretion. As a young man, Luther continues, he lacked that discretion; hence he was "led astray." He then begins to define his "mature" exegetical principles:

> Ever since I began to adhere to the historical meaning, I myself have always had a strong dislike for allegories and did not make use of them *unless the text itself indicated them or the interpretations could be drawn from the New Testament* [italics added] (I, 232-233).

He then returns to his earlier captivity by the allegorical interpretations of the Origenistic school:

> But it was very difficult for me to break away from my habitual zeal for allegory; and yet I was aware that allegories were empty speculations and froth, as it were, of the Holy Scriptures. It is the historical sense alone which supplies true and sound doctrine. After this has been treated and correctly understood, then one may also employ allegories as an adornment and flowers to embellish or illuminate the account. The bare allegories [that is, Alexandrian allegories], which stand in no relation to the account and do not illuminate it, should simply be disapproved as empty dreams. This is the kind which Origen and those who followed him employ (I, 233).

As illustrations of acceptable allegory, he lists Christ's statement concerning the kingdom of heaven as signifying the church; Paul's allegory of Adam and Eve (Ephesians 5: 32), or marriage itself, as a "type of Christ and the Church"; Adam as the "first figure of Him that was to come" (Romans 5: 14); Paul's identification of Sarah and Hagar as an allegory of the two covenants (Galatians 4: 24); and the Tree in Eden as an allegory of the Law and the Tree of Life as the Gospel counterpart. He then concludes:

> There is no need at all for dwelling at greater length on this matter of allegory. Let this reminder suffice: that those who wish to make use of allegories, make use of those which the apostles point out and which have a sure basis in the words themselves or in the historical account (I, 234).

In this passage, like Tyndale, Luther does not condemn allegory *per se*; he does condemn Alexandrian allegory, yet he makes clear that allegorical interpretation is a part of the apostles' methods, that allegories are in the texts themselves, and that allegories are related to the literal sense and historical account.

The distinctions which Luther makes in the commentary on Genesis are reiterated in nearly every major work. In the "Lectures on Deuteronomy," for example, Luther notes that he has "added brief allegories . . . for almost every chapter." He again criticizes Origen and Jerome who "did not employ a sufficiently felicitous and helpful method of devising allegories." So that readers would not be deceived by false allegories, he has

> reckoned it worth the effort to show them that it is a proper allegory when, so far as possible, they discover in every allegory the ministry of the Word or the progress of the Gospel and faith. For this is the purpose of whatever figures or meanings there are in the Law and the people of Moses (IX, 7).

In presenting his first allegory, "Concerning the Hidden Meanings of This Chapter," he prefaces his comments by a warning:

> . . . we should beware of Jerome, Origen, and similar fathers or read them with independent judgment. Yes, we should beware of that whole Alexandrian school, which the Jew Philo extols, according to the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome, for having once excelled in the pursuit of such allegorical interpretation. For later writers unhappily imitated their example, which was adopted with excessive praise (IX, 24-25).

In the "Lectures on Galatians" Luther again warns that interpreters should not "rave with Jerome, who was so deceived by his precious Origen that he understood almost nothing in Paul . . ." (VI, 275); these men (Origen and Jerome) "deserve to be criticized, because they made awkward and inept allegories out of the simplest statements of Scripture, in which allegories have no place" (XXVI, 433). Luther extends his condemnation of Alexandrian allegory to Augustine, linking him with Jerome and Origen:

> These men do not concern themselves with the faith when they devise allegories; they look for philosophical ideas, which are profitable neither for morals nor for the faith, not to mention that they are even rather silly and absurd (II, 151-152).

In numerous passages, Luther explicitly identifies false allegories with the Alexandrian School, condemning Origen, Jerome, Augustine (for whom he often has the highest praise), and the Scholastic commentators who incorporated Alexandrian allegory in the glosses: "O wretched Christians, whose Scripture and faith still depend on the glosses of men. . . . These things are worthless and blasphemous."[29] Yet, Luther does not condemn allegory; it is an exegetical method used by the canonical authors of the New

---

[29] *Early Theological Works*, p. 334. Luther's attacks on the *glossia* are much more virulent than on the early Fathers. His term of supreme contempt for the allegorists whose interpretations appear in the glosses is "sophists": "Their glosses as well as their text, their subject matter as well as their vocabulary are alien to the entire usage of Scripture . . ." (p. 359). See also pp. 344, 347, 351, 353, 357, and so on.

Testament, and, properly used, an acceptable tool of the biblical exegete. Moreover, even Luther the Great Reformer occasionally interprets scripture according to the four-fold level of interpretation. In commenting upon Paul's assertion that Abraham's relationship to Sarah and Hagar is to be interpreted as an allegory, Luther notes that "there are usually held to be four senses of Scripture." Thus, according to this schema, Isaac and Ishmael are,

> in the literal sense, the two sons of Abraham; allegorically, the two covenants, or the synagog and the church, the Law and grace; tropologically, the flesh and the spirit, or virtue and vice, grace and sin; anagogically, glory and punishment, heaven and hell, yes, according to others, the angels and the demons, the blessed and the damned (XXVII, 311).

Luther adds that "this kind of game . . . may be permitted to those who want it," providing they acknowledge the literal sense of the passage. "These interpretations," he continues, "add extra ornamentation . . . to the main and legitimate sense, so that a topic may be richly adorned by them. . . ." Luther calls multiple interpretations of this kind a "four-horse team" (XXVII, 311); although the four-fold sense does not represent his exegetical principles, he occasionally uses it as an "extra ornamentation," indicating how these methods can be viewed as logical extensions of the literal sense. On the other hand, Luther invariably condemns Alexandrian allegory and those who practice it, for the Origenistic approach discards the literal, historical meaning.[30]

Unlike Tyndale, however, Luther does not insist that the literal sense is also the spiritual sense; on the contrary, Luther consistently interprets scripture according to a two-fold sense: literal and spiritual. Because of its unique message, the Old Testament not only deals with the experiences of the Hebrew people, but also looks forward to Christ; the Old Testament "law and way of life must therefore be seen in two ways."[31] Luther consistently calls the two levels of scripture the literal and spiritual meanings. In the "Preface to the Old Testament," for example, Luther explains that as a history of the

---

[30] I have cited only a few representative passages of Luther's condemnation of Alexandrian allegory and his identification of it with the medieval glosses. For further examples of his defense of non-Alexandrian allegory, see Works, II, 154 ("allegory teaches, comforts, and encourages us in an excellent manner"); II, 156 ("In order to comfort and strengthen our hearts, allegories must be directed toward the promises and teaching of the faith"); VIII, 269 (". . . a true and good allegory . . . is the spiritual and proper understanding"); in interpretations of different Psalms (XIV, 299, 318, 335, 338); and so on. Non-Alexandrian allegory is central to Luther's exegesis, although he continually warns that allegory must not discard the literal sense nor be used as the sole method of interpretation.

[31] Paul Althaus, The Theology of Martin Luther (Philadelphia: 1966), p. 95. My discussion of Luther's spiritual sense of scripture is based upon Althaus' extensive analysis of Luther's hermeneutic principles (see "The Holy Scripture," pp. 72ff.).

Hebrew people and an expression of their faith, the Old Testament Scriptures "are not to be despised, but diligently read" (XXXV, 236), for the Old Testament is the "ground and proof" of the New and is to be "highly regarded." On the other hand, however, beyond the literal meaning of Old Testament events and rites is a "spiritual meaning" (XXXV, 247), for Moses and the prophets "are nothing else than administrators . . . bringing everyone to Christ through the law." To interpret the Old Testament "well and confidently," Luther asserts, one must "set Christ before you, for he is the man to whom it all applies, every bit of it" (XXXV, 247). Luther expressly distinguishes "spiritual interpretation" from the allegorical interpretations of Origen, Jerome, and "many other distinguished people" (XXXV, 235), for such interpretations are not based upon the literal meaning of the text and by their very nature ignore the historicity of the Old Testament.[32] In contrast to this approach, Luther respects the

---

[32] Like Aquinas, Luther asserts that the tropological, allegorical, and anagogical levels may all be comprehended in the "spiritual" sense. Unlike Aquinas, however, Luther does not further sub-divide the spiritual sense. For his discussion of the relationship of the literal and spiritual senses to the four-fold level of interpretation, see XXVII, 310ff. In the same context, Luther asserts that when Paul says that the "letter killeth but the spirit giveth life" he means only that without Christ (the spirit) the Hebrew law (the letter) can only lead to death.

Richard Kehoe maintains that Aquinas' hermeneutic principles are limited because he does not present the historical experiences of the Hebrew people because in Christ the history of the Old Testament actually reaches the goal which God has planned for it. As a result,

> Luther can thus place the original literal meaning and the spiritual interpretation beside each other and bring them into a vital relationship to each other through his concept of "sign" or "type."[33]

Luther's use of typology is extensive; in numerous instances, the type-antitype construct is basic to his view of the sacraments, and typological identifications occupy a central part of his analysis.[34] In addition,

---

spiritual sense as the "very soul of the Literal sense." While warning against over-extravagant typical identifications, Kehoe maintains that one should interpret types as "clues to the Spiritual Sense," for types are "certain brilliant moments in biblical history" which "rely upon a great network of biblical data for their real significance . . ." (see "The Spiritual Sense of Scripture," _Blackfriars_ [July, 1946], XXVII, 246-251). Types function in this way in Luther's interpretations, for he insists that the literal sense of the Old Testament, apart from a typical reading, remains only the history of a foreign people.

[33] Althaus, p. 97.

[34] In the sacramental controversies of 1524-1527, for example, Luther carefully distinguishes among the different biblical terms which are used to explain Christ's statement, "This is my body." Because of his developing theory of consubstantiation, Luther insists that there is a literal equation of the bread and Christ's flesh. Several of his opponents had interpreted the text to read, "This is the _figura_ of my body," using the term to mean the "real essence." Luther's answer indicates in a specific and concrete way his knowledge of New Testament typology and his rejection of the Latin connotations of _figura_: ". . . _figura_ is an obscure and ambiguous word. Of course, he [Oecolampadius, Luther's opponent] would like to interpret it to mean parable, type, or interpretative sign,

throughout his writing types are referred to in the most casual manner, indicating the central place which typology occupies in Luther's thought.[35] In the early "Lectures on

---

just as one describes the stories in the Old Testament as figures of the New, as Adam is called a figure or type of Christ, or as a bride is called a type or figure of the Church. But figura in the Latin language does not mean that kind of type [that is, in a technical, typological sense]; the word figura is misused in such an instance" (XXXVII, 109).

[35] The title page of Luther's Bible and of the numerous translations which followed indicate how closely associated typology was with Luther's interpretations. The title page to the complete 1541 German edition has, for example, several type-antitype balancing scenes. At the bottom of the page, in the left-hand column, the wicked are being thrown into the fires of hell; to the right is the Crucifixion. Directly above these two dominant scenes are representations of Adam and Eve eating of the fruit of the Tree in Eden (center, left) and Christ in the tomb destroying death (a skeleton) and sin, represented as a snake (center, right); at the upper left, the children of Israel bow down before the brazen serpent in the Wilderness; to the right, Christ's Ascension is depicted (the plate is reproduced in V. H. H. Green, Luther and the Reformation [New York: 1964], p. 118). The title page of the Dutch version of Luther's 1533 translation presents a similar series of balancing scenes: Adam and Eve parallel the Crucifixion in the vertical center; Moses receiving the Tables of the Law parallels the Annunciation; in the center background the brazen serpent is represented; in the foreground a skeleton on the left side is contrasted to a figure stepping from the tomb onto a skeleton (reproduced in Bainton, Frontispiece). Finally, in a Slavonic translation of 1663, the title page presents (from top to bottom) parallel scenes of Adam and Eve and Christ on the Cross, the brazen serpent and Christ rescuing the "spirits in prison," and Adam and Eve being driven from Paradise and Christ glorified, standing on his crypt (reproduced in G. S. Wegener, 6000 Years of the Bible [New York: 1963], p. 213). The first English printing of the Geneva Bible (1614) also includes typological identifications. The symbols of the Twelve Tribes of Judah parallel woodcuts of the Twelve Apostles (Wegner, p. 238). Even in this title

Hebrews," Luther uses typos, schema, and figura as generally synonymous; in his later writing he ordinarily uses the terms figure and type, quite often together as if to restrict the meaning of the Latin term to its original significance in Greek. In discussing the relationship of the two covenants, for example, he uses both terms to introduce his analysis, discarding figure after his first comment:

> Now God always worksso that the figure or type appears first, and then the true reality and fulfilment of the type follows. So the Old Testament first comes forth as a type, and the New Testament follows as the true reality (XXXVII, 254).

Yet, Luther is not consistent, for he uses picture, example, and image in the typical sense; moreover, in the early gloss on Hebrews 9: 18, he uses "figures and types" in connection with the four-fold method, and in later works he calls certain New Testament types "theological allegories" or simply "allegories." In the "Lectures on Genesis," for example, he condemns the allegories of Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and the "canonists" (whom he calls

---

page, however, several symbols of medieval allegory are retained: the authors of the four gospels are represented in small woodcuts above and below the title. The medieval allegorical identifications are retained in the woodcuts; Matthew's symbol is a seraph, Mark is represented by a lion, Luke by a bull, and John by an eagle (Wegner also reproduces a twelfth century lavishly ornamented brass cover with the Evangelists' symbols represented in each corner, p. 145).

"the asinists of His Most Execrable Lordship, the pope") because they are "fabricated by one's own intellect and ingenuity, without the authority of Scripture" (II, 151). He immediately adds, however, that "these remarks must not be understood to mean that we condemn all allegories indiscriminately, for we observe that both Christ and the apostles occasionally employed them." He then calls Peter's typical identification of the Flood a "beautiful allegory" and a "theological allegory," Christ's reference to the brazen serpent and Paul's statement about the rock in the Wilderness "allegories," and directly equates the crossing of the Red Sea with baptism: "the Red Sea is truly a baptism." Because Luther clearly distinguishes between Alexandrian allegorizing and the typological allegory of the New Testament, he apparently sees no need for a more precise terminology. Moreover, typology is so much a part of his exegesis that regardless of which term he uses, the context makes clear that the various terms are used in a typical sense.[36]

---

[36] Jaroslav Pelikan, the editor of the American edition of Luther's Works, notes that the "principle that Biblical history was always church history enabled Luther to attach the label 'historical' to an exegesis of the Scriptures which seems to modern eyes allegorical or at least typological" (Luther the Expositor [St. Louis: 1959], p. 90).

Luther's assumption that "every bit" of the Old Testament applies to Christ leads inevitably to an extensive array of typical identifications. David "is a type of Christ, as are Solomon, Aaron and all the other figures of the Old Testament";[37] twenty-seven psalms are interpreted in a typical sense;[38] and in interpreting a single verse, Proverbs 8: 30 ("I was delighted every day, playing before Him, playing in the world . . ."), Luther correctly maintains that the Hebrew verb is mistranslated in the Vulgate and should read "it was My delight to display and reveal Myself in this manner," that is, typologically:

> . . . in the sacrifices, in circumcision, in burning incense, in the cloud, in the Red Sea, in the manna, in the brazen serpent, in the tabernacle of Moses, in the Temple of Solomon, and in the cloud (I, 248).

Luther is so insistent on the typological rendering of the single verse in Proverbs that he apparently fails to notice that he identifies the "cloud" twice.

Typical identifications appear in every major work of Luther; these have been cited simply to indicate the range of material which is interpreted typologically.[39]

---

[37] Early Theological Works, p. 335.

[38] Heinrich Bornkamm, Luther und das Alte Testament, cited in Althaus, p. 94.

[39] Other typical identifications include Joseph

One should note, however, that for all of his use of typology, Luther is not simply a medieval allegorist in the robes of a Reformer. It is true that he does not escape using typical identifications found in medieval allegory, for Luther knew the commentaries too well to avoid being influenced by them. It is also true, however, that he recognized and condemned the interpretations of the Alexandrian School and of the scholastics. Moreover, he repeatedly insists that biblical interpreters

> should strive, so far as possible, to get one, simple, true, and grammatical meaning from the words of the text; and when we have it, then nothing prevents us from seeking figures and allegories in the text (VIII, 146).

Like the authors of the New Testament, Luther's theology is christological; Christ is presented in the Gospel and prefigured in the Law; typology, in this sense, is the literal meaning of the text.

Tyndale's use of typology is cautious and restrained; in Luther's writing typology is only one of numerous exegetical methods and its use is ordinarily incidental to the main point at issue. Without typology,

---

(VIII, 140), the Paschal lamb (XXXV, 262), Abraham (XXVI, 436), Melchizedek (II, 387), the Red Sea and the crossing of the Jordan (XXXV, 66), and numerous identifications of Moses, the Exodus types (manna, water from the rock, the brazen serpent, etc.), Aaron, Joshua, Jonah, and so on. I have not found a single major work in the American edition which does not contain typical identifications.

however, Calvin would not be Calvin; for typology occupies a central and significant role in his theology. Unlike Tyndale and Luther, Calvin insists that many passages must be interpreted typologically: "the whole cultus of the law, taken literally and not as shadows and figures corresponding to the truth, will be utterly ridiculous."[40] Moreover, while Calvin condemns the interpretations of Alexandrian allegorists, he is equally vehement in his condemnation of the "literalists." In attacking the sacramentalists who interpret Christ's statement, "This is my body," transubstantially, that is, as a literal identification of the eucharistic bread with Christ's flesh, Calvin asserts that it is "an intolerable blasphemy to declare literally of an ephemeral and corruptible element that it is Christ." The statement, Calvin insists, must be interpreted "figuratively," according to the common usage of metonymy in the Scriptures:

---

[40] John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John T. McNeill (Philadelphia: 1960), I, 249. All page references to the Institutes refer to this edition. As my citations indicate, Calvin uses "image," "figure," "shadow," "foreshadow," and "promises" (in reference to the Old Testament) as synonymous with "type." In discussing the "Peculiarities in Calvin's Exegesis," H. Jackson Forstman calls attention to the typological meaning of these terms and notes that Calvin "had a weakness for typology" (Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority [Stanford: 1962], p. 106).

> Let our adversaries, therefore, cease to heap unsavory witticisms upon us by calling us "tropists," because we have explained the sacramental phraseology according to the common usage of Scripture. For as the sacraments agree in many respects, so in this metonymy they all have a certain common ground with one another.

To illustrate the "common usage of Scripture," Calvin cites one of the earliest, most traditional, typical identifications:

> Accordingly as the apostle teaches that the rock from which spiritual drink sprang forth for the Israelites was Christ [I Cor. 10: 4]--because it was a visible sign under which that spiritual drink indeed truly was, but was not discernible to the eye--so the body of Christ today is called bread, inasmuch as it is the symbol by which the Lord offers us the true eating of his body (Institutes, II, 284-285).

The recognition of the validity of typological interpretation is inescapable to any Reformer who insists on a return to "Holy Writ"; typology is as much a part of the Scriptures as is prophecy. Yet, Calvin is more deeply committed to typology than most Reformers; for his dependence upon the Old Testament for the outlines of church polity, the centrality of the covenant in his theology, his reading of the spiritual nature of the sacramental symbols, and his commitment to the doctrine of the Trinity, make typological readings inevitable.[41]

---

[41] For a discussion of Calvin's use of the Old Testament as a guide in church polity, see R. N. Caswell, "Calvin's View of Ecclesiastical Discipline," John Calvin: A Collection of Essays (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1966).

In the Institutes ("Containing almost the Whole Sum of Piety and Whatever It is Necessary to Know in the Doctrine of Salvation"), for example, a discussion of the trinitarian nature of the Godhead occurs quite early in Book I and is preceded only by a discussion of the methods of knowing God and the assertion that the Scriptures are the final means for ascertaining the true nature of God. In Calvin's view, the "infinite majesty" of God makes direct communication with Him impossible; the references in the Old Testament to individuals who beheld God "face to face" should not be interpreted to mean that they saw God as "He really is," but only "as far as He can be beheld by mortal man."[42] In order to reveal Himself, then, it was necessary for God to "veil" his majesty in signs and

---

pp. 210-226; Francois Wendel, "The External Means," Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought (New York: 1950), pp. 291ff.; and Georgia Harkness, John Calvin: The Man and His Ethics (New York: 1931), especially Chap. IX, "God and the State." Calvin's "covenant theology" is analyzed by Peter Y. De Jong, The Covenant Idea in New England Theology: 1620-1847 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1945), pp. 18ff.; Everett H. Emerson, "Calvin and Covenant Theology," Church History (June, 1956), XXV, 136-144; and Perry Miller, The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (New York: 1939), I, 365ff., and "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," Errand into the Wilderness (Cambridge, Mass.: 1964), pp. 48-98. Finally, for an excellent analysis of Calvin's sacramental theology, see Ronald S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1957), especially Chaps. XI-XVIII.

[42] Commentary on Ezekiel 1: 28, cited in Wallace, p. 2. I am indebted to Wallace's analysis of Calvin's doctrine of revelation.

symbols which man could comprehend. Hence, Revelation involves an original "veiling" and necessitates a subsequent "unveiling." If God were only a single entity, He would forever remain hidden to the eyes of men; because of the gulf between infinity and finitude direct revelation would be impossible. From the beginning, however, God planned for a Mediator between Himself and man in the Old Testament: the Word of God, the second Person of the Trinity. Calvin insists that Christ as the Word of God "abides everlastingly one and the same with God, and is God himself" (Institutes, p. 130), yet that God "never did . . . reveal Himself outside of Christ."[43] Thus, the totality of the Old Testament, as Wallace notes, is an account of how Christ

> breaks in upon the life of those whom He has chosen to make His people, and confronts them in these veiled forms through which they can come to know His nature and have communion with Him (p. 9).

(The Holy Spirit, as the third person of the Godhead, performs the same function after Christ's Ascension, for the Word promised to send His "comforter" to abide with, and mediate between, man and the "awe-ful majesty" of God.) According to Calvin, the frequent appearance of the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament is, in reality, the record of the veiled appearance of "God's only-begotten Son, who afterwards was manifested in the flesh. . . ."[44] In the Commentary on Zechariah, Calvin notes that

---

[43] Commentary on John 5: 23, cited in Wallace, p. 8.

> there is then no wonder that the Prophet should indiscriminately call Him Angel and Jehovah, He being the Mediator of the Church and also God. He is God, being of the same essence with the Father; and Mediator, having already undertaken His Mediatorial office, though not then [in the Old Testament] clothed in our flesh so as to become our brother; for the Church could not exist nor be united to God without a Head.[45]

In His appearance in the Old Testament, however, Christ was veiled in "shadows," for "until Christ was manifest in the flesh all signs shadowed Him. . . ." God's revelation, even through the office of Mediator in the Old Testament, was, as Calvin notes in the Commentary on Hebrews, by the "circuitous course of types and figures" (p. 98). Hence, the Old Testament, far from being solely a history of the Hebrew people and a "book of law," is a "book of promises" which find their realization in Christ. Calvin insists, however, that there is a substantive difference between the "nature or quality of the promises [of the Old Testament]" and the promises of the New Covenant: "the gospel points out with the finger what the law foreshadowed under types" (Institutes, I, 426). Calvin warns his readers "to remember to open up their way with [typology,] the key" to understanding the Old Testament and its relationship to the New.[46]

---

[44] "Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses," Calvin's Commentaries (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1956), I, 248. Unless otherwise noted, all citations to Calvin's commentaries refer to this 45-volume edition.

[45] Cited in Wallace, p. 9.

Calvin is less severe in his condemnation of allegory than are Tyndale and Luther. He invariably condemns the excesses of Origenistic allegory, yet he often accepts the allegorical readings of "les Docteurs anciens" if the text supports such readings. In discussing St. Paul's assertion that Abraham's wives are to be interpreted as an allegory of the two covenents, for example, Calvin clearly distinguishes between legitimate allegory and "subtle frenzies":

---

[46] Calvin's identification of typology as the "key" to "open up" the Old Testament is found in the Institutes, Book II, p. 447. My discussion is simply a brief summary of the principles which Calvin develops at length in Book II of the Institutes: "The Knowledge of God the Redeemer in Christ, First Disclosed to the Fathers under the Law, and Then to Us in the Gospel." Nor is this summary a selection of isolated texts; typology dominates his discussion in the seventeen chapters of Book II. In Chapter XI, "The Difference Between the Two Testaments," for example, Calvin notes that the Old Testament "foreshadowed spiritual happiness by . . . types and shadows"; that a major difference between the Old and New Testaments "consists in figures: that, in the absence of the reality, it showed but an image and shadow in place of the substance"; that the messages of the prophets are "embodied in types"; and that because the Old Testament "bore the image of things absent, it had to die and vanish with time. The gospel, because it reveals the very substance, stands fast forever. . . ." Moreover, each statement in the Institutes about the nature of typology can be paralleled in every commentary dealing with the Old Testament and nearly every commentary on the New Testament books.

> He [Paul] says that what is here read, was written allegorically: not that he wishes all histories, indiscriminately, to be tortured to an allegorical sense, as Origen does; who, by hunting every where for allegories, corrupts the whole Scripture; and others, too, eagerly emulating his example, have extracted smoke out of light. . . . The design of Paul was, to raise the minds of the pious to consider the secret work of God, in this history; as if he had said, What Moses relates concerning the house of Abraham, belongs to the spiritual kingdom of Christ; since, certainly, that house was a lively image of the Church.[47]

In this passage, and others as well, although Calvin condemns Alexandrian allegory, he accepts without question the restricted use of allegorical interpretation. Moreover, he asserts that what has been said of the house of Abraham (the Jewish nation) is a type ("lively image") of the Church. On the other hand, in discussing the distinctions made in the ceremonial law between clean and unclean animals, Calvin accepts with little hesitation the allegorical interpretation of "*les Docteurs anciens*" as found in the *Glossa Ordinaria*:

> Whilst I fear that but little confidence can be placed in the allegories, in which many have taken delight; so I do not find any fault with, nor even refuse that which has been handed down from "*les Docteurs Anciens*," viz., that by the cleaving of the hoof is signified prudence in distinguishing the mysteries of Scripture, and by the chewing of the cud serious meditation on its heavenly doctrines; although I cannot approve of the subtlety which they add, viz., that those "rightly divide the

---

[47] *Commentary on Genesis*, I, 545.

> word" who have known how to elicit mystical senses from its letter; because hence it has come to pass that they have allowed themselves in all sorts of imaginations. I therefore embrace the more simple notion, that they who only have a taste for the carnal sense, do not divide the hoof. . . . The chewing of the cud ought to follow, duly to prepare and digest the spiritual food; for many gulp down Scripture without profit. . . .[48]

It would be misleading to assert that this kind of interpretation is common in Calvin; it is equally misleading to say that he condemns out of hand either allegorical or typological readings.[49]

---

[48] Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, II, 61-62.

[49] Calvin's assumption that everything in the Old Testament foreshadows Christ occasionally leads to rather extravagant identifications, from the modern point of view at any rate. One should note, however, that unlike most of medieval allegory, Calvin's "excesses" arise from an attempt to make sense of the literal meaning of the Old Testament rites and ceremonies. Moreover, Calvin's predicament is based upon his conviction of the absolute authority of all scripture; to admit that certain aspects of the ceremonial regulations of the Old Testament are only reflections of the peculiarities of Jewish worship in a specific historical period would open the door to human decisions concerning the validity of any portion of scripture, the Old or New Testaments, and effectively destroy the sole authority of the Bible.

It is in this context that Calvin asserts (as Miller cites in Roger Williams, p. 35) that "it is better to confess our ignorance than indulge in frivolous conjectures." The passage in which this citation occurs is Calvin's discussion of the dimensions and ceremonial significance of the Tabernacle (Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, p. 174). The Tabernacle, Calvin notes, was not to be viewed as an end in itself, for ". . . the people should not rest their attention on the visible tabernacle, but with the understanding of faith should penetrate to heaven, and direct their minds to the spiritual

Calvin's extensive use of typology is based upon his conviction that Christ is everywhere revealed in the Old Testament, not in his full glory of course, but in types and shadows which are intimations of the future fulfillment of promise. According to Calvin (and in this he agrees with Luther and Tyndale), all of the Old Testament represents the "letter" of the Law; the New Testament

---

pattern, the shadows and types of which they beheld" (p. 174). Calvin then proceeds to interpret the Tabernacle, its furniture, and the garments of the High Priest typologically.

On at least one occasion, however, Calvin does not confine his typological interpretations solely to the Old Testament, as he normally insists must be done, and as Chrysostom and other members of the Antiochene School insisted before him. In his writings on the Magdeburgian controversy, Calvin condemns the literal sacramentalists and insists that types are found in the New Testament as well as the Old: ". . . If it be asked whether they admit no figure in the Supper, they answer, Let the thing itself remain, and away with tropes, shadows, and all darkness, as suited only to the Old Testament. Let the reader remember that we are here treating of figure. These literal masters utterly repudiate it, and though they use invidious names, they annihilate the most essential property of a sacrament. For what is a sacrament without type or figure? . . . Whether types and figures are suitable to the Old Testament only, let the Holy Spirit answer for himself, who appeared twice in the form of a dove, and a third time in tongues of fire . . ." ("Last Admonition to Joachim Westphal," *Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1958], II, 428-429). This is the only passage I have found in which Calvin admits of a typological reading of the New Testament; he normally insists that in Christ all of the promises of the Old Testament were "contained and fulfilled, [and] in him they ceased, as we have already repeated several times . . ." (*Institutes*, II, 1477-1478).

presents the "spirit" of the New Law. St. Paul's statement that the "letter killeth but the spirit giveth life" refers to the essential differences between the shadowed revelations of the Old Testament and the reality of the New. Hence, Calvin asserts that Paul's statement points to the basic differences between the Law and the Gospel; he calls

> the former literal, the latter spiritual doctrine; the former he speaks of as carved on tablets of stone, the latter as written upon men's hearts; the former is the preaching of death, the latter of life; the former of condemnation, the latter of righteousness; the former to be made void, the latter to abide.[50]

Taken by itself, the Law leads only to death. On the other hand, except for those who mistakenly confuse the "sign with the thing signified," the rites and ceremonies of the Law "contained a promise of spiritual and eternal life." In order to make certain that those under the Law were continually aware of the future promises, God

---

[50] Institutes, p. 456. Calvin develops the contrast between the literal and spiritual in Book II, Chapters XI-XIII. I am simply summarizing the central statements of these chapters. The two-fold sense of scriptural interpretation which characterizes the exegetical principles of Luther and Calvin was also advocated by the early Greek Fathers (see above, pp. 77ff.); the same approach was central to the principles of the Antiochene exegetes. The extent to which Calvin was indebted to these commentators, whom he frequently cites, cannot be determined. It is clear, however, that he knew their treatises and that his methods, particularly in relation to typology, are similar enough to suggest direct indebtedness.

"foreshadowed spiritual happiness by . . . types and symbols," in "figures," in the "image and shadow" of the future reality. According to Calvin, these promises are "mentioned almost wherever the New Testament is contrasted with the Old" (Institutes, I, 452-453). Hence, typology is the single most important method for interpreting the Scriptures, for types provide New Testament authors--and all Christians as well--with a "key" to understanding the promises of Christ in the Old Testament; moreover, as types indicate, the children of Israel did not live under the irrevocable sentence of the Law, but in continual awareness of the greater life to come. For Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, and all of the prophets, repeatedly foreshadow the promises made manifest in the flesh: "it was always their custom to describe through the types of their own time the truth which has been revealed by the gospel" (Institutes, II, 1433). Typology, then, is divinely ordained; in its "shadowy forms" it reveals the presence of God, as much as His presence can be revealed, before the sum of all types "became flesh and dwelt among us."

Calvin is far more conscious of the origins and early development of typology than is Luther. Luther directs his attacks primarily at the allegorizing of the commentators as reflected in the glosses; Calvin also disparages the glosses, but his citations of the Fathers are drawn ordinarily from the Greek and early Latin commentators whose writings on typology were little affected by Origenistic allegory. In addition, he is clearly aware of the closer relationship to New Testament typology of the Antiochene School than the interpretations of the School of Alexandria. In the Institutes, for example, Calvin refers to Origen seventeen times; none of these references is related to Origen's occasional limited typological interpretations, and all but two are highly critical of his methods. On the other hand, Calvin refers to "golden Chrysostom" more than forty times, citing specific typological interpretations with which Calvin obviously agrees. And, in the Commentary on Colossians, Calvin adopts Chrysostom's "painter" analogy to define the typical relationship of the testaments:

> As painters do not in the first draught bring out the likeness in vivid colours and expressively but in the first instance draw rude and obscure lines, so the representation of Christ under the law was unpolished--a first sketch, but in our sacraments it is seen drawn out to the life.[51]

Moreover, Calvin's references to the typology of the early Fathers are often to their specific treatises on typology. He cites with only slight disagreement Augustine's interpretation of the "eighth day" in the Contra Faustum (Institutes, II, 1339), Justin Martyr's interpretation of the Exodus types in the Dialogue with Trypho (Institutes, I, 133), the discussion of typology in Chrysostom's Homily on I Corinthians, typical identifications found in Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil (all members of the Antiochene school), and so on. Calvin's knowledge of the Church Fathers is not limited, of course, to works which are primarily typologically oriented nor to the interpretations with which he agrees; his theology has a much broader base than that. But, in Calvin's typology, at any rate, Ad Fontes applies to the early Fathers as well as to the Scriptures.[52]

---

[51] Cited in Wallace, p. 34. For a discussion of Chrysostom's comparison of types to a "rude sketch," see above, pp. 121ff.

---

[52] Although not systematic in his categories, Calvin generally discusses types in relation to Old Testament events, persons, and ceremonies. In the Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, for example, he identifies the deliverance from the Wilderness as a type of the resurrection (IV, 346), the pillar of fire as a type of the sacrament (I, 236), Aaron (I, 49) and Moses (I, 293) as types of Christ, circumcision (III, 285), the brazen serpent (IV, 156), the Paschal Lamb (I, 221), the Passover (I, 458), and the veil of the Temple as types of Christ and the Sacraments, and the golden candlesticks (II, 163), hyssop, oil, and the fire of the sacrifices (I, 218; II, 402), as types of the Holy Spirit. In the Commentary on Genesis, the Ark is identified as a type of the church (I, 257, 273), the Flood itself as a type of baptism (I, 273), Melchizedek, Joseph, and Jacob's Ladder as types of Christ (I, 388; II, 261; II, 113), and so on. Some books of the Bible are more typologically oriented than others (Genesis, Exodus, Matthew, and The Epistle to the Hebrews, for example) and one would expect explicit typical references in all of the Old Testament commentaries and in each book of the Institutes.

The typology of the Reformers, however, is not the typology of the Middle Ages, of stained glass windows and such works as the Biblia Pauperum. Reformational typology is much more restricted in the number of identifications, and it conspicuously avoids Patristic identifications which support Catholic dogma, such as Eve and the "burning bush" as types of the Virgin Mary. When such identifications are inescapable, as in the case of the "priestly" function of Melchizedek, the Reformers insist on a "literal" reading of the text which, inevitably, supports the Protestant position. Melchizedek, for example, offers bread and wine to Abraham because Abraham has returned from battle and is in need of refreshment. Even if one admits that the bread and wine are types of the Eucharist, as Calvin does, the Reformers hasten to note that in Christ all "shadows and types" find their fulfillment and cease to exist. Protestants generally insist on the supremacy of the literal sense and warn against using "figures" as a basis for doctrinal positions. Yet, in the sacramental controversies which were waged over the interpretation of Christ's statement, "This is my body," Protestants condemn the literalists and interpret the phrase figuratively, "according to the usage of scripture." Typology could be used as evidence for Protestant as well as for Catholic dogma. Typology had been used to support doctrinal positions during the early centuries of Church development: Justin Martyr turned types against Trypho the Jew,and Augustine had used types to confute Faustus the Manichean.

In discussing the idea of reform in the early church, Gerhart B. Ladner suggests that

> the greatest contribution, perhaps, of the Old Testament to Christian ideology of reform was through prophecy and "typology." The prophets not only foretold the coming of Christ, but they also are the great exemplars of all authentic reformers within the Church. . . . Furthermore, all through Christian history, typology, the sacramentum futuri, the mystery of the expectation and anticipation of Christ and the Church in the Old Testament, acted as a stimulus for further reform in the spirit of the Gospel: the sequence of creation, Incarnation and reform is a fundamental pattern in early Christian and mediaeval historical consciousness and theology of history.[53]

One cannot say with certainty whether typology was an impetus to reform or simply a byproduct of the larger concerns of the Reformation. It is certain, however, that typology, isolated from Alexandrian allegory and divorced from medieval Scholasticism, was a central part of the Reformers' approach to the Scriptures. Moreover, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, the first Protestant study devoted solely to typological identifications could appear without the slightest suggestion of apology for adapting a "Scholastic" method to Protestant exegesis.[54]

---

[53] Gerhart B. Ladner, The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers (Cambridge, Mass.: 1959), p. 53.

---

[54] I have limited my analysis in this chapter to those works which deal primarily with typology. Typical identifications appear in so many works of the period that citations from them would be simply repetitious. William Ames, whose theological reputation among English and Colonial Puritans was unsurpassed, illustrates, in one of the single most important theological treatises of Puritanism, the orthodoxy of typology. In discussing the relationship of the Old and New Covenants in *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, Ames makes explicit that the most cherished Puritan doctrines had their bases in a typological reading of the Old Testament: Justification, Sanctification, Adoption, and Glorification are all "typed" forth in the ceremonies of the Law. Illustrating how the "promises" of the Old Testament are all to be interpreted typologically, Ames presents in a single paragraph many of the basic images of typology: "From the time of *Moses* unto *Christ*, all these same were further shadowed, by meanes both extraordinary, and also ordinary.

"Redemption and the application hereof was extraordinarily signified. I. By the deliverance out of *Egypt* by the Ministery of *Moses* as a type of Christ. *Mat*. 2.15. And by the bringing into the Land of *Canaan* by the Ministery of *Josuah*, as another type of Christ. 2. By the brasen Serpent, by the beholding whereof, men that were like to dye were restored to health. *John* 3.14. 12.32. 3. By the cloud, whereby the *Israelites* were covered from all the injuries both of their enemies, and of the Heaven. And moreover they had light, together with refreshing of their strength administered by day and by night. I *Cor*. 10.2. *Esay* 4.4. 4. By passing through the red Sea, whereby they had a way cast up to the Land of promise, their enemies being overwhelmed and destroyed. I *Cor*. 10. 2. 5. By *Mannah* from Heaven, and Water out of the Rock, whence they received continuall nourishment, as it were out of Gods Hand I *Cor*. 10.3 & *John*. 6.32.33" ("Of the administration of the Covenant before Christ," *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity* [London: 1638], p. 173). Such identifications occur regularly throughout his work.

I have further excluded from my analysis the allegorical interpretations of the Book of Canticles and Revelations. Although the numerous seventeenth century

By 1620, when William Guild published Moses Unvailed: or Those Figures which Served unto the patterne and shaddow of heavenly things, typology was an orthodox Protestant method of interpreting the Scriptures.[55]

---

interpretations of these two works contain typological identifications, their primary mode is allegorical. For representative Puritan works of this kind, see John Cotton, A Brief Exposition of the Whole Book of Canticles (London: 1642), and Thomas Brightman, A Revelation of the Revelation that is the Revelation of St. John (Amsterdam: 1615). For an excellent discussion of the allegorical traditions and seventeenth century analyses of Canticles, see Stanley Stewart, The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth Century Poetry (Madison, Wisconsin: 1966).

[55] Guild's study went through three London editions (1620, 1626, and 1658); it was reprinted in Glasgow in 1701 and again in Edinburgh twice in the eighteenth century. "Moses Unvailed" is a reference to Paul's statement (II Corinthians 3: 13) that the Gospel is presented in "great plainness of speech: And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face. . . ." The veil, Paul continues, is "done away in Christ." Guild also may be referring to the "veil of false glosses" with which the scholastics had distorted the Scripture; the phrase is used with this significance in Tyndale, Luther, Calvin, and Samuel Mather. Christ unveiling Moses was an iconographical commonplace, frequently occurring in statuary and stained glass (see Rackham, p. 48).

It is difficult to judge the extent to which Guild may have influenced Puritan typology; I have discovered no reference to his book in Puritan writing. He was known as a "weak, time-serving man," who apparently had little difficulty in serving as chaplain to Charles I, yet, during the Commonwealth, being chief among the ministers who destroyed the "images" of the cathedral and chapel at Aberdeen. His "conversion," however, was not very convincing; he was deprived of his living by Cromwell's military commissioners in 1651. It is hardly likely, however, that his work went unnoticed by men like Samuel Mather. Mather is extremely knowledgeable concerning Patristic and Reformation typology. (For information relating to Guild's life, see The Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Leslie

Guild's work is apparently an attempt to popularize typology; unlike subsequent studies there are no explicit references to the complex Patristic and medieval traditions associated with types. His work has a "primitive," unsophisticated quality about it, suggesting that Guild was attempting to create a kind of Protestant _Biblia Pauperum_. He could not have been unaware of Patristic traditions, for the rigorous course of study for his M. A. would have exposed him to the Fathers, even if only through the writings of the Reformers. Yet, like the _Biblia_, Guild's typical identifications are obvious and his discussions of them are relatively simple.[56] In fact, Guild's work is a kind of "typical guide" to the Old Testament; his type-antitype identifications are rigidly chronological, beginning with the Tree of Life in the

---

Stephen and Sidney Lee [Oxford: 1921-22], VIII, 766-767.) In citing from Guild's work I have followed his practice of italicizing all proper nouns, but I have not italicized, as Guild does, the Dedication and my citations from the text itself. Guild italicizes every statement referring to the New Testament.

[56] Guild identifies fifty-five types; twenty-four of them are persons in the Old Testament who prefigure Christ (Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Melchizedek, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, the High Priest, Joshua, Gideon, Jepthah, Samson, Samuel, David, Solomon, Elisha, Daniel, Jonah, Jehoshua, Zerubbabel). All but Jehoshua and Zerubbabel are also typically presented in the _Biblia_. Of the remaining twenty-six types (relating primarily to Old Testament ceremonies), only fourteen are not represented in the _Biblia_, largely because of the difficulty of presenting them pictorially (the burnt offering of fowls, for example).

Garden of Eden and ending with Zerubbabel, the last of the Old Testament kings. And, like the Biblia, the parallels between the type and antitype which Guild discusses often turn upon etymology or upon the simplest analogies. Moses is a type of Christ, for example, because Moses means "drawne, or taken out"; in like manner, "so was Christ drawne out of the waters of many afflictions, to bee consecrated our Saviour, and taken out of the race of mankinde to bee that Blessed Seed, Gen. 3.15" (p. 47). Moses and Christ were both "meanely borne," placed in rough beds as infants, were both shepherds, deliverers, meeke, faithful, and so on, through twenty-six parallels. On the other hand, although Guild does not directly indicate a knowledge of Patristic allegory, his typical interpretations often suggest, if only by implication, an awareness of the complex traditions of the Fathers. In the parallels between Moses and Christ, many of Guild's identifications are based upon simple likenesses; yet, at the same time, a number of them reflect traditions which are not found in Calvin or Luther.

After the three days' march into the Wilderness, for example, Moses sweetens the bitter waters of the spring at Marah by casting his staff into the pool (Exodus 15: 25); according to Guild, "so hath Christ our afflictions, by the Crosse that he did beare" (p. 50). The identification of Moses' staff with the Cross is one of the earliest typical identifications: Tertullian asserts that the staff "was none other than Christ himself"; Didymus says that "when Moses sweetened the waters with his staff, he proclaimed beforehand the salvation of all mankind . . . , for he was a type of Christ [and] his staff was a type of the Cross"; and St. Ambrose identifies the staff with the priest's making the sign of the cross over the baptismal candidate:

> Water, without the preaching of the Lord's Cross, is of no value for salvation, but when it has been sanctified by the mystery of the saving Cross, then it is ready to be used as a spiritual bath and healing drink. As Moses cast his staff into the spring, being a prophet, so does the priest proclaim over the water the Lord's Cross. . . .[57]

Luther and Calvin--and Samuel Mather--avoid such identifications because they lead to an association of the priest with the sacraments; moreover, Tertullian, Didymus, and Ambrose are Alexandrian exegetes, and interpretations like theirs are responsible for the allegorical traditions which were codified in the glossia. Such identifications in Moses Unvailed, however, occur with enough frequency to suggest that Guild was aware of Patristic interpretations and that he was not reluctant to use them when they suited his purposes.[58] Yet, it is this obvious kind of parallel which dominates both the Biblia and Guild's work, parallels, however, which suggest a broad knowledge of the backgrounds of typology.

---

[57] Cited in Daniélou, pp. 171-172.

Guild also seems to be trying to establish some kind of method for presenting types apart from the theological context in which they had ordinarily occurred. The fact that he issues a single work devoted to typical identifications suggests such a purpose; moreover, the methods he uses to structure and order his material, unlike the scattered typological interpretations in the Reformers' treatises, create a pattern for discussing typology which is adopted in subsequent studies. Guild does not discuss a theory of types, nor does he insist on principles which limit typical identifications. Although the magnificent first sentence of his book brings together nearly all of the traditional phrases associated with typology, he adds nothing new to the terminology:

---

[58] In the same context, Guild also includes a parallel which was first identified by the author of the Epistle to Barnabas, the first typological work to reflect Philonian exegetical principles. During the early period in the Wilderness, the Israelites were forced to fight the Amalekites; so long as Moses stood on a hill over the battle with his arms upraised, the Israelites were victorious. When his arms dropped, they began to lose (Exodus 17). In the first century, the author of the Epistle to Barnabas identifies Moses' upraised arms as a type of the Cross: "God spoke again to Moses, telling him to make a type of the Cross, and of him who would die on it, for unless they hoped in him they would be subject to war forever." Tertullian asserts that "while Joshua was fighting against Amalek, Moses was praying with his hands outstretched, because when the Lord wrestled with the devil the Cross was necessary." St. Cyprian cites the same episode: "Through this sign of the Cross, Amalek was overcome by Jesus through Moses"; Justin Martyr also notes that "the people gained the victory . . . because he himself [Moses] was a type of the shape of the Cross" (cited in Daniélou, pp. 168-169). Guild identifies the same incident, noting that Moses prayed with his "hands up": "So by the intercession of Christ, grace is given us to overcome our spirituall enemies, and Gods wrath is altogether quenched, Heb. 8.6" (p. 50).

> As in the Creation darkness went before light, or as the dawning precedes the brightnesse of the day, & as Joseph obscurely at first behaved himselfe unto his Brethren, and Moses covered with a vaile, stood before the people: Even so (Right Reverend) in the detection of the glorious worke of man Redemption, mystical promises went before mercifull performance, darke shaddowes were the fore-runners of that bright substance, obscure types were harbingers to that glorious Anti-type the Messiah, who was comming after, and Levi's Law with its figurative and vailed ceremonies, was the vive [live?] resemblance, painting and pointing out that cleere Lampe and Lambe of God, the expresse Image and ingraven Character of the Father: So that as folded in swaddling clouts, and lying in a Crib, hee was seene and shewne unto the Wise-men that came from the East; so involved in typicall ordinances, and lurking under shaddowish signes, hee was offered and exhibited unto the Jewes that saw his day but afarre off; the eclipsed and dimme light of the Moone (as it were) as yet onely glimmering, or the twinkling brightnesse of starry Lamps as yet onely dazedly glistering: Until the true Phosphorus, that glorious Sunne himselfe did arise in the Horizon of our humanitie, dispersing the beames of his bounty, and manifesting himselfe to be that onely light of the world, promised to them that sit in the Region of darkness, for comfort and illumination, and to the joy of all in heaven and earth, the Lambe himselfe onely opening that sealed Booke, and unfolding the truth of former hid mysteries (pp. A3-A5).

There is scarcely another single citation which summarizes so well the terminology and basic concepts of typology: "mystical promises," "darke shaddowes," "fore-runners," "figures," "typicall ordinances," are explicitly contrasted with "fulfillment," "glorious Sunne," "manifesting himself," "the truth of the former hid mysteries," and so on. Luther's concept of the relationship of the Law and Gospel, Calvin's (and Chrysostom's) image of the rude sketch, Calvin's image of the Old Testament as the New folded in "swaddling clouts,"[59] the medieval and early Renaissance identification of the morning star with the "Sunne Himselfe"--all of the traditional terms, in addition to specific Catholic and Protestant concepts, are included in Guild's first paragraph. Moses Unvailed is, in a sense, a microcosm of the conflicting schools and differing traditions reflected in the seventeenth century. At the same time, however, Guild makes explicit a method of dealing with types which is only inchoate in the Reformers' works. For after listing the various ways Christ is presented in the Old Testament, he categorizes the

---

[59] Calvin's comparison is found in the Institutes (I, 350ff., and IV, 1334ff.). In his annotations to the Institutes, McNeill notes that "closely allied with his typology is Calvin's oft-repeated idea of the childlike stage of development of the ancient Hebrew people, a condition that rendered necessary the accommodation of revelation to an elementary mentality in the Old Testament" (I, 350, n3).

"successive diversitie [as] types of sundry things, places, persons, and actions," noting that these categories reflect the order in which "they occurre in Scripture" (p. A8). He identifies the cleansing of the leper (Leviticus 14) and the sacrifice of the red heifer (which he interprets as an allegory of the blood of Christ) as "actions" typifying Christ; such "things" as the rock in the Wilderness, manna, the brazen serpent, the veil in the Temple, the golden candlestick, etc., prefigure various aspects of Christ's life. Finally, the Tabernacle and the Temple are "places" which typify Christ's mystical body, the Church.[60] Guild's categories are somewhat artificial; he often includes a type in more than one category (the rock in the Wilderness is included in things, places, and actions).

Guild also establishes a format which, with only a few changes, becomes the standard procedure for presenting type-antitype parallels. In identifying Aaron as a type of Christ, Guild lists five similarities (the fewest of any identification):

---

[60] In addition to the twenty-four personal types (listed in n. 56), Guild makes the following typical identifications: circumcision, the Passover, the Tree of Life, Jacob's ladder, the pillar of fire, the rock in the Wilderness, manna, the brazen serpent, the Ark of the Covenant (prefiguring both Christ and the Church), the mercy seat, golden censor, table of the show-bread, candlestick, altar of perfume, altar of burnt-offering, brazen laver, the burnt offerings of beasts and fowls, the sin- meat- and peace-offerings, the daily and yearly sacrifices, the scapegoat, and Solomon's Temple. Like Calvin, Guild felt it necessary to interpret typologically the various Hebrew rites and ceremonies; nearly half of his book is devoted to a rather minute identification of their typical significance (the Passover types Christ's passion in thirty-four separate ways).

Aaron

1. *Aaron*, a Teacher, or the mountaine of fortitude.	So is Christ the true Teacher of his Church, and exalted mountaine of invincible strength, Math. 10.21.
2. Hee was *Moses* mouth to the people, Exod. 4.30.	So was Christ his Father's mouth, to the world; in declaring his will, Joh. 1.
3. He was the blesser of the people, Lev. 9.22.	So is Christ the true blesser of his people and Church, Gen. 12.3.
4. Hee was the High Priest of the Lord, Lev. 8.	And so was Christ that onely true High Priest of his faithfull, Heb. 9.
5. He dyed on the top of Mount Hor, called Mosery, Numb. 20.	So Christ dyed on the top of Mount Golgotha, Luke 23.

In each case, Guild completes the single unit by pointing out that the type does not contain the full substance of the antitype; it is the shadow of the reality:

> The Disparitie.
>
> *Aaron* dyed in the wildernesse for his own offence, for disobeying the Lord at the waters of *Meribah*: but Christ Jesus our High Priest dyed in *the world*, for our offences and manifold disobedience imputed to him, and undertaken by him. Also *Aaron* brought not the people into *Canaan*, neither

> entered there himselfe: but our High-Priest hath both entered himselfe into that heavenly Canaan, and bringeth the members of his true Church there also (pp. 66-68).

Most of Guild's discussions are more complex, although he retains the relatively simple identifications illustrated in his discussion of Aaron's typical significance. Ordinarily, however, he cites more than twenty similarities in each of the type-antitype identifications. Moreover, Guild's identification of fifty-five types is somewhat misleading, for within each single identification, numerous other typical parallels are often established. In discussing Noah as a type of Christ, for example, Guild presents twenty-five parallels, some of which are actually separate typical incidents, and had been so viewed by the Fathers and the Reformers. Noah typifies Christ; in addition, the Ark is a type of the Church, the Flood prefigures the "fire [which] shall come to destroy the second world" (originally presented in Justin Martyr), the pitch which made the Ark waterproof is a type of Christ's protection of the members of the Church, Noah was saved by the Ark as Christians are saved by "Christ's Redemption" in the Cross, the dove sent out signifies Christ sending the Holy Spirit, the rainbow is a type of the New Covenant, and so on.

In most cases, the supplementary typical parallels are closely related to the literal sense, and they occur in Guild's discussion of type-antitype constructs which had been extensively analyzed by the Fathers, especially the Antiochenes, further suggesting his knowledge of the earlier typological traditions. On the other hand, in several instances, particularly in relation to the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish faith, Guild reflects the allegorical interpretations of both the Alexandrian school of exegesis and of the Reformers' attempts to determine the "spiritual" significance of the peculiarities of Jewish worship.[61] In the analysis of the typical significance of the Exodus, for example, the Antiochenes had interpreted the water gushing from the rock in the Wilderness as a type of the Eucharist; on the other hand, the Alexandrians, with the exception of St. Ambrose, viewed the incident as a type of baptism. In the context in which Chrysostom compares the nature of types to a painter's rude sketch, he also discusses the Red Sea as a type of baptism, the cloud as a type of the Holy Spirit, and the rock as a type of the Eucharist:

> . . . After the passage about the sea, the cloud and Moses, Paul goes on: "and they all drank of

---

[61] In either case, Guild's approach is very similar to the allegorical typology of the Puritans. For my definition of allegorical typology, see pp. 39ff.

> the same spiritual drink." Just as you, he says, coming up out of the bath of the water, hasten to the table [and] find a new and wonderful table, I mean the manna. And just as you have a wondrous drink, the cup of salvation, so did they; for even when there were no springs, or running waters, an abundance of water gushed forth from a dry and barren rock.[62]

Theodoret identifies the "water from the rock [as] the Saviour's blood" in the "divine mystery" of the Eucharist; St. Ambrose asserts that "the priest strikes the rock with the work of God [Moses' rod]: the water flows and the people of God drink." On the other hand, Tertullian, Origen, St. Gregory of Elvira, and Augustine identify the water with the sacrament of baptism; St. Cyprian, an Alexandrian exegete, expressly criticizes the Eucharistic interpretation: "the Lord is speaking not of the chalice, but of Baptism . . ." (p. 195). Luther, following the Antiochenes, identifies the rock as a type of the Lord's Supper; and Calvin is quite explicit in interpreting the rock as a type of the wine used in the Supper:

> The water gushing from the rock in the desert was for the fathers a token and sign of the same thing as wine represents for us in the Supper. For Paul teaches that they drank the same spiritual drink (Institutes, II, 1377).

Guild does not explicitly identify in the parallels the incident with the Lord's Supper:

---

[62] Cited in Daniélou, p. 193. Unless otherwise noted, all citations of the typical identifications of the rock refer to Daniélou's translations.

3. It seemed wonderfull, and almost incredible even unto *Moses*, that God would make the Rocke to give water to such murmuring people.	So likewise was it a wonderfull work of love, that the Lord should make his owne Sonne to shead his heart-bloud, for such a rebelious generation. . . .
4. It gave water aboundantly unto the people, when they could get no other to quench their thirst. . . .	So Christ shead his bloud aboundantly, when nothing else would redeem us, nor quench the tormenting thirst or grieved conscience, and this bloud only is sufficient to purge all our sinne perfectly. . . .
5. It was first striken with *Moses* Rod, before it yeelded forth the waters. . . .	So was Christ nailed to the Crosse . . . our transgressions of the Law beeing laid upon him, before his precious bloud issued forth of his heart and wounds, to consummate the Redemption of his Church, Luke 23 (pp. 78-79).

In "The Disparitie," however, he points out that "all Israel promiscuously did drinke of the Rock" but that "so shall not all in the visible Church bee partakers of the bloud of Christ. . . ," identifying explicitly the reference to the Lord's Supper, and relating his interpretation to the Antiochene approach.

This is not to say, however, that Guild consciously avoids the allegorical methods of the Alexandrians. In a number of instances, his interpretations are quite similar to Alexandrian allegory. In identifying the typical significance of the High Priest's garments, for example, "the colours of the embroidering of his garments being Blue, Purple, Skarlet and White," signify

> the truth of his [Christ's] Propheticall Office, the majestie of his Royall, the perfection of his Priestly, and his sincere sanctitie in execution of all, with all other his resplendent grace beautifying his blessed person . . .(p. 69).

The bells and pomegranates which hang at the bottom of the High Priest's robe "shaddowed his [Christ's] proclaiming of the joyfull Gospell, and confirming the same by his holy workes and miracles on earth. . . ." On the other hand, most Reformers, and Puritans as well, cannot escape allegorical readings when attempting to determine the typical significance of the minute details of the Jewish rites. Calvin's interpretation of the bells and pomegranates is, according to Wallace, "unusually farfetched":

> Although there was no smell in the pomegranates, yet the type suggested this to the eyes; as if God required in that garment a sweet smell as well as a sound to cover up our stink through the foulness of our sins. God would give the bells a sound because the garment of Christ does not procure favour for us except by the sound of the gospel.[63]

Unlike the Reformers, and the typologists who follow him, Guild does not insist on a literal reading of scripture, he makes no attempt to distinguish between proper and improper allegory, nor does he attack the Fathers or the glosses. His work is unselfconscious; he simply presents a rather disorganized list of types, which, so it seems, he recognizes as he leafs through the Old Testament. He includes many of the traditional types; he also includes such figures as Jehoshua and Zerubbabel who are rarely identified as types except in such medieval geneological representations as the Jesse Tree. His identifications suggest that he is aware of interpretations of the Greek and Latin Fathers, as well as the work of the Reformers. Yet, he seems to see no contradictions between their approaches; or, if he does (and this is equally possible), they are of no importance to him. Subsequent studies will be somewhat more attuned to the necessity of theological distinctions, for Puritans are careful to avoid any interpretation which would support Catholic dogma.[64]

---

[63] Commentary on Exodus, cited in Wallace, p. 54, n5.

Apart from its reflection of the various Patristic and Protestant backgrounds of typology, Guild's study is significant, for it indicates certain changes in Protestant attitudes toward typological interpretations; moreover, his study emphasizes a characteristic which is only incidental in the Reformers' approach but which dominates later studies. The absence of any criticism of the Fathers in Guild's work marks a break with the Reformers' practice and anticipates the incorporation of certain Alexandrian techniques within Protestant typological practice. The Reformers occasionally adopt the allegorical approach in scriptural interpretation, yet they invariably condemn the excesses of Alexandrian allegory. In addition, because typology is not presented as an hermeneutic method in and for itself, but in relation to much broader theological concerns (Luther's concept of the relationship between the Law and the Gospel and Calvin's use of typology to support his theology of the Trinity, for example), the typology of the Reformers is generally related to major aspects of Hebrew life and thought. Hence, their attacks on Alexandrian allegory and the glosses are part of much broader doctrinal concerns. When these doctrinal positions are clearly defined and the basic distinctions between the Catholic and Protestant approaches are firmly established, typology has, in one sense, served its primary purpose. Typological interpretations continue to exist, of course, yet they become increasingly involved in the minutia of Jewish ceremonial observances and extended to a listing of minor, somewhat strained, parallels. The pattern of development in the seventeenth century is quite similar to that in the theological treatises of the first five centuries and to the extensive typical identifications in the art of the Middle Ages. In the _Dialogue with Trypho_, Justin Martyr makes relatively limited use of typology to define the basic differences between the Christian and Hebrew faiths; Augustine's _Contra Faustum_ is an elaborate typological defense of orthodox Christianity against the Manichaean heresies of the _Letter of Faustus_. Between Justin Martyr and Augustine, however, are three centuries of developing typological interpretations; between the four typological series of the Church of St. Maria Maggiore and the more than one hundred windows of King's College Chapel are ten centuries of artistic and theological elaborations. Once central identifications are established, successive typologists can only repeat the Reformers' statements and concern themselves with relatively minor relationships, as the Latin Fathers and medieval artists did before them. Puritan typologists continue to attack Patristic interpretations; yet even Samuel Mather recognizes that medieval allegory is no longer a challenge to the New England Way: "Men must not indulge their own Fancies, as the Popish Writers _use to do_, with their Allegorical senses . . . [italics added]" (p. 55).

---

[64] Guild also includes in Moses Unvailed a "Harmony of all the Prophets, breathing with one mouth the Mysterie of his Comming. . . ." Guild lists fifty-five incidents in the life of Christ, from His birth to the Ascension; for each incident he indicates the Old Testament passages which prefigure that specific aspect of Christ's life.

Calvin's "far-fetched" typological interpretations, for example, ordinarily occur in relation to Jewish ceremonies. Even these, however, are relatively few in number and are secondary to the main point at issue: rites and ceremonies prefigure Christ and cease in His assumption of the Priestly role. On the other hand, Guild devotes more than 100 pages to a discussion of the typical significance of Jewish ceremonies and objects used in worship; Abraham prefigures Christ in only thirteen ways, but the Ark of the Covenant suggests twenty-nine typical identifications. In Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows (London: 1635), Thomas Taylor discusses approximately the same material in more than 150 pages;[65] Samuel Mather extends his analysis to nearly 400 pages. Many of the same Old Testament figures are identified as types of Christ, although each author varies in the number of parallels he discusses. On the other hand, each succeeding study analyzes in greater detail the typical significance of the ceremonies. The result is, in general terms, a combination of certain methods of the Antiochenes and the Alexandrians. By insisting on the literal relationship between the two testaments and the historicity of the Hebrew and Christian accounts, the School of Antioch foreshadows Luther's assertion that "every bit" of the Old Testament prefigures Christ, and Calvin's conviction that the Mediator exists in each aspect of Hebrew history and ceremonial action. Hence Calvin's attempts to interpret the typical significance of the bells and pomegranates. At the same time, however, faced with determining the significance to the Protestant faith of such Jewish ceremonies as the "burnt offering of fowls," Protestant typologists, and especially New England Puritans, are reluctantly led to an increasing number of allegorical readings. Like Origen of Alexandria, Protestant typologists turn to allegory to effect a reconciliation between the Old and New Testaments.

---

[65] Although Taylor died in 1633, his works were edited by an associate pastor and close friend, William Jemmat. The 1635 edition was titled Christ Revealed, or the Old Testament explained; for some unaccountable reason, Jemmat changed the title of the 1653 edition to Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows . . . Opened and Explained. My citations are from the second edition; the text is identical with the first edition.

Taylor was a prolific writer, compiling over forty titles in his life. He was a strong Puritan who, according to his admirers, "stood as brazen wall against popery." For his denunciation of Bancroft's severe treatment of Puritans, he was silenced by Archbishop Harsnet; Oxford replied to this harsh treatment by awarding Taylor the D. D. (DNB, XIX, 465-466). One would expect from a man of his reputation rather severe criticism of Patristic interpretations, particularly in relation to typology. The fact that in Moses and Aaron there is only one, relatively minor, attack on papists, and only a passing condemnation of the scholastic sacramental conception of marriage, indicates the gradual change in attitudes toward the use of Patristic methods in typological analysis.

This is not to say, however, that Protestant allegory is solely a re-worked version of Origen's principles: there are two significant differences. First, the allegory of Protestant typologists is informed by a two-fold sense of biblical hermeneutics; it does not attempt to determine tropological and anagogical readings beyond the literal and spiritual meanings. Such readings occur, but they are viewed as part of, not in addition to, the spiritual or Gospel interpretation. The distinction, to the Puritans particularly, is not simply an artificial one; for from their point of view, tropological and anagogical readings are twice removed from the literal sense and are a distortion of it. All passages have a literal and spiritual meaning; the spiritual meaning may have, and often does have, moral and eschatological implications, but in every case these arise from the literal level. Hence, the Protestant translators use the term "ensample" in a dual sense: in the general ethical sense of a pattern to be imitated in one's moral actions, and in the limited technical sense of typos. Secondly, Protestant allegory, unlike Alexandrian allegory, is based upon an extensive use of the typical event. As has been shown in the preceding chapters, Alexandrian allegory essentially subordinates types, relegating them exclusively to the literal sense or discarding them entirely. In Protestant allegory, however, typology becomes of crucial significance; for types are one of the two central methods by which the Old and New Testaments are related. Hebrew prophecy is the second; and from the work of the earliest New Testament authors, prophecy, after its fulfillment in Christ, becomes part of typology. Prophecy implies future fulfillment;

typology asserts that the consummation has occurred. Hence, allegorical typology, as it has been defined in the Introduction, limits the vehicle of allegory to the Old Testament and its tenor to the New. According to Origen, for example, the clean animals in Noah's Ark signify "memory, culture, understanding, reflexion and judgement upon what we read"; the unclean animals represent "desire and anger."[66] In addition, the clean animals may also signify the seven powers of the soul (the five senses, speech, and the generative faculty) and the unclean animals may represent the ill uses which man often makes of the powers of the soul. To Samuel Mather, however, the clean and unclean beasts signify that

> in the Church there are both Saints and Hypocrites: Hypocrites are unclean Beasts. A Cham in the Ark; a Judas, a Devil in Christ's own Family. In the visible Church there be sometimes Wolves within, and Sheep without: Tho' they are Wolves in Sheeps clothing; for prophane Persons may, and should be kept out; but close Hypocrites cannot. As in the Ark tho' there were ravenous Beasts; yet their Natures were restrained: So in the Church, such as are Beasts by nature; yet the Corruption of their Natures is restrained, there is restraining Grace upon Hypocrites in the Church, as well as renewing Grace in the Saints(p. 75).

Both Origen and Mather interpret the Ark as a type of the church and the deluge as a type of baptism. Beyond this meaning, however, Origen sees a "deeper mystery" which can only be understood by moving beyond the literal and typical senses to an allegorical reading. Mather also allegorizes the same passages; in each case, however, the type-antitype construct limits his allegory solely to the relationship between the two testaments. It would be misleading to assert that the differences between the two approaches are always this explicit. Augustine, an Alexandrian exegete, also interprets the clean and unclean beasts as a sign "that good and bad take part in the sacraments of the Church,"[67] avoiding the allegorical abstractions of Origen; and at times Mather's allegorical typology is hard to distinguish from Origen's practice. In most cases, however, the distinctions are clear, and it is the relative importance allotted to typology which marks the line between Patristic and Protestant allegorizing.

---

[66] See above, pp. 88ff.

These distinctions are only implicit in Moses Unvailed; allegorical typology appears only occasionally, and then in relation to the various burnt-offerings of the Jewish ceremonies. In Taylor's Moses and Aaron, however, Puritan typology has its beginning proper, for certain characteristics established in Taylor's work appear with very little modification in the two remaining seventeenth century typological studies, Samuel Mather's The Figures or Types of the Old Testament (London: 1673) and Benjamin Keach's Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors (London: 1682).[68] Unlike Guild, Taylor clearly reflects certain principles of his Protestant predecessors; moreover, he explicitly acknowledges the typological studies of the Church Fathers, citing from specific works and identifying those works in the marginal notations. In

---

[67] "Contra Faustum Manichaeum," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1956), IV, 789.

---

[68] There is some confusion concerning the relationship of Keach's Tropologia to Salomon Glassius' Philologia Sacra (Jena: 1623-36). Victor Harris (p. 11, n 15), following Miller, asserts that Tropologia is a redaction of Glassius. Philologia contains five books; types are briefly discussed in Book II, "The Spiritual Sense of Scripture," in relation to the literal and mystical senses, allegory, and parables. This discussion is, however, quite brief; types, in conjunction with allegories and parables, are viewed as one of the figurative modes of scripture which point to a "spiritual" meaning. (I have been unable to obtain a first edition of Philologia; my analysis is based upon the 1691 edition in the Library of Congress.)

On the other hand, Tropologia contains only four books, Books IV and V of Philologia being combined in a single book, Book IV, of Tropologia. Book I of Tropologia is signed by T. D. (Thomas Deloune), the translator; Book II is signed by Keach; and Books III and IV are not signed. More importantly, however, the brief discussion of types in Book II of Philologia has been substantially expanded in Book II of Tropologia. The title pages are identical, except for the addition of a "Treatise of Types," signed by Keach.

Although Glassius' work was available early in the century, a complete discussion of types does not appear in the work until it is issued by Deloune and Keach as Tropologia. I have, therefore, excluded the possibility of Glassius' influence on the development of Puritan typology, and considered Tropologia as the last of the seventeenth century discussions of a theory of types.

A briefe declaration of the sacraments, for example, Tyndale asserts that the "figures" of the Old Testament refer primarily to the "spiritual" meaning of the types and shadows in the same way as the external act of baptism points to an inner, sacramental change. Taylor's position is identical to Tyndale's; moreover, his statements are so similar as to suggest a paraphrase of Tyndale's work:

> Those Ceremonies were not given to merit remission of sinnes . . . but to shew justification by Jesus Christ, the truth and substance of them; to be types of him, pointing at him in whom the Father is pleased; . . . exhibiting in the new Testament . . . [the] Sacraments and seales of faith . . . (p. 4).

Taylor also repeats Calvin's image of types as Christ "wrapped in swadling clouts, which hid his glory." The Law, again repeating Calvin, is a "Primer, or A. B. C. in which Christ was to be shaddowed in a dark and obscure manner . . ." (p. 3). It is true that Taylor does not specifically acknowledge either Tyndale or Calvin, and these statements were no doubt common to much of Protestant thought. Yet, his expression of them is so similar as to suggest direct indebtedness.

On the other hand, there is no question as to his debt to Patristic commentators, and to specific works which are primarily typologically oriented. Taylor cites more than twenty times from Augustine's Contra Faustum; he also cites from Tertullian's Homily on Baptism, Cyril of

Jerusalem's Procatechesis, and Theodoret's Commentary on Exodus, works which extensively utilize typology. In addition, there are references to St. Ambrose, Jerome, St. Anselm, and Aquinas. Although Taylor occasionally cautions against extravagant allegorical interpretations, he does not refer to Origen by name; moreover, he reflects both the Antiochene (Cyril and Theodoret) and Alexandrian (Tertullian and Augustine) approaches. His indebtedness to Patristic commentators, however, extends considerably beyond explicit acknowledgement; his discussion of the typical significance of Moses, for example, indicates an extensive knowledge of Patristic analyses. Moses types Christ in four major ways: in his person and estate, in his office and function, in his passion and suffering, and in "sundry particular actions." Taylor identifies four specific parallels between the person and estate of Moses and Christ; each parallel, in almost the same wording, also appears in Guild. Both were "meanely borne," both were persecuted by cruel rulers, both were shepherds, and both were of a "meak and sweet disposition." In fact, all of the twenty-three parallels which Taylor identifies are also found in Guild's twenty-six parallels. Unlike Guild, however, Taylor explicitly identifies the Patristic source for at least one parallel, a typical construct which is found primarily in Antiochene interpretations. During the wilderness wandering, the Hebrews were forced to fight the Amalekites; Moses, standing with his arms upraised, led them to victory, "figuring" forth Christ's victory on the Cross. In a marginal note (p. 40), Taylor identifies the source of this typical interpretation as the Commentary on Exodus of Theodoret, the leading fourth century exponent of the School of Antioch. Guild makes the same identification; he does not, however, indicate any source.

Although Taylor cites from Alexandrian and Antiochène interpretations, except for his allegorizing of the significance of the ceremonies, he is careful to avoid the extravagances of Origenistic allegory. In his identification of the water flowing from the rock in the wilderness as a type of the Lord's Supper, for example, he follows the Antiochene (and Luther and Calvin) rather than the Alexandrian interpretation of the water as a type of baptism. Moreover, the four citations from Aquinas which appear in Moses and Aaron are not related to typology, but to Aquinas' explanation of the scriptural passage which says that the "waters of the Rock smitten followed the Israelites" (see pp. 263ff.). Unlike Mather and Keach, Taylor seldom criticizes Patristic commentators, and never with the vitriolic language which both Mather and Keach use; he is cautious, however, to restrict his typical identifications to the context of the Bible and to avoid any allegorizing of the historical incidents in Christ's life. In this approach, Taylor is quite similar to Eusebius, for he ordinarily focuses upon typical identifications which prefigure the historical narrative of Christ's life. Taylor compares the forty fast days of Moses on Sinai with Christ's fasting in the wilderness, the lifting up of the brazen serpent with the Crucifixion, Moses' death on Mt. Abarim with Christ's death on Golgotha, the miracle of the manna with the miracle of the loaves and fishes, Moses' sweetening of the bitter waters of Marah with Christ's sweetening of mankind's afflictions by the wood of His cross, Moses' transfiguration on Sinai with Christ's Transfiguration on Mt. Tabor, and so on. Each of these parallels had first been identified by Eusebius in _De Demonstrationes Evangelicae_;[69] all of them were adopted and elaborated upon by subsequent Fathers, particularly by the Alexandrians. Yet Taylor's presentation, although he does not specifically acknowledge Eusebius' work, is much closer to Eusebius' methods than to the Alexandrian allegorical interpretations. Moreover, Taylor's typical identifications are more restrained than those of the Church Fathers; his identification of typical persons is even more limited than that of Guild, who lists twenty-four typical persons in contrast to Taylor's thirteen.[70]

---

[69] For my discussion of _De Demonstrationes Evangelicae_, see above, pp. 110ff.

Taylor discusses types under two main headings: holy persons and holy things. More than two-thirds of his study, however, is devoted to the latter category, for he attempts to determine the significance of the numerous ceremonial observances of the Hebrew faith. He divides "holy things," for example, into those which are "ordinary" (circumcision and the Passover) and "extraordinary" (the pillar of fire, the cloud, manna, water from the rock, etc.), further subdividing ordinary ceremonies into "substantial" (the sacrifices) and "circumstantial" (such as the Tabernacle which was adapted to the nomadic life of the Jews and later replaced by the Temple). Taylor's extensive allegorical interpretation of the minutia of Jewish ceremonial ritual is, in its own way, similar to the rather strained typical representations in stained glass windows; for Taylor, like the medieval artists, introduces an external framework which forces him to identify a certain number of parallels. The external framework imposed in medieval art is the dimension and artistic design of the window; Taylor's framework is the three-part sermon pattern. Because of his careful division and subdivision, Taylor is forced to identify enough parallels in relation to each ceremony to make up a single sermon. Mather will later avoid this by grouping several ceremonies and ceremonial objects in one sermon, yet he too will become enmeshed in the difficulties of identifying the antitypical significances of Hebrew worship. The "heretic" who objected to Langton's allegorical interpretation of the red heifer, for example, would find Taylor's interpretation incredible; for Taylor draws three major parallels (totalling eleven identifications, including in each at least two secondary relationships), in addition to four "Uses." The "properties required of this Cow," according to Taylor, are four: she must be a heifer; she must be red; she must be without spot or blemish; and, finally, she must never have been yoked. The significance of the second "property" is as follows:

---

[70] Taylor's omission of such typical persons as Enoch, Jepthah, Jehoshua, and Zerubbabel is understandable, for even Guild's parallels are quite often somewhat strained. His omission of such figures as Abraham and Jacob, however, is quite striking, for he is the only seventeenth century typologist who does not discuss them. His failure to discuss Abraham and the covenantal relationship is, particularly for a Puritan, quite unusual. The covenant relationship is not so closely identified with typology until the work in the following decade of Johannes Cocceius (see below, pp. 317ff.); Taylor, an English Puritan, is perhaps not as concerned with a defense of the covenant as are Mather and Keach.

> The Cow must be red: Signifying,
>
> 1. The truth of Christs humane nature, being of the same red earth that the first Adams body was.

> 2. The grievousnesse of sinne which he was to undertake, and the scarlet stain of it.
>
> 3. The bitter and bloudy passion of Christ, and his cruell death. The red skin of the Cow resembled the red garments of Christ all besprinkled:
>
>   1. With his own bloud.
>
>   2. With the bloud of his conquered enemies.
>
>   3. Presented unto his father, like the coat of _Joseph_, all stained with bloud.[71]

Such interpretations are the result of the Protestant insistence that "every bit" of the Old Testament has typical significance, and the conviction that every interpretation, even the typological, must respect the literal sense. Added to these restrictions, however, is the necessity of adapting allegorical typology to the sermon framework. In many of his interpretations, Taylor (unlike Mather and Keach) is obviously ill at ease. One should note, however, that this is not Alexandrian allegory; the parallels which Taylor identifies are limited to a biblical framework and related closely--perhaps too closely--to the literal sense.

Unlike the Church Fathers, particularly the Antiochenes, neither the Reformers, nor Guild or Taylor, devote any major part of their works to an analysis of a theory of types; typology is an _a priori_ commitment of their exegesis. Such is not the case, however, with either Mather or Keach; for both men are concerned to develop in specific detail hermeneutic justification for typology. This aspect of their work may be the result of their extensive knowledge of the Church Fathers, and their careful attempts to distinguish between Patristic and Puritan allegorical methods. More than likely, however, Mather and perhaps Keach are indebted to the work of Johannes Cocceius, whose writings on covenant or "federal" (foedus) theology were based upon a specifically stated and highly individualistic theory of types.[72] Although there are

---

[71] I have modified the typography of the original printing to indicate clearly the number of subdivisions.

---

[72] Cocceius, a pupil of William Ames during Ames's lectureship at Franeker, came from a family of jurists in Bremen; his "juristically educated mind was probably inclined to make the question of the importance of the Old Testament the central aspect of his thought" (Brumm, p. 26). After studying Hebrew in Hamburg, Cocceius went to Franeker, purposely to study with Ames; after Ames's death in 1632, Cocceius remained in Franeker, where, in 1636, he became professor of Hebrew. In 1649, he was appointed Lecturer in Theology at the University of Leyden, retaining that post until his death twenty years later (see Biographie Universelle: Ancienne et Moderne [Paris: 1843], VIII, 500-501; and Brumm, pp. 25-28).

Although Miss Brumm indicates that she has been unable to find "any evidence which shows that Cocceius directly influenced American Puritans" (p. 27), Miller has identified numerous references to Cocceius' typologically oriented Summa Doctrinae de Foedere et Testamento Dei (Leyden: 1648), and has traced certain aspects of covenant theology to Cocceius (see The New England Mind, I, 502ff.). Miller, however, does not identify Cocceius as a typologist. Although the evidence is not conclusive, it is unlikely that Samuel Mather was unaware of Cocceius' work. In The Figures or Types, Mather extensively analyzes the typical significance of the covenantal individual works which incorporate typological interpretations, Cocceius' major statement of typical theory is presented in his most complete statement of federal theology, Summa Doctrinae de Foedere Testamento Dei.[73] Much

---

relationship, often in terms which are quite similar to Cocceius' statements. In addition, during the period Cocceius lectured in Leyden, Samuel's brother Nathaniel was the minister of an English church in Rotterdam, and in close contact with Samuel, who then held a pastorate in Dublin. The close relationship in Cocceius' work between the covenant and typology would make the Summa Doctrinae especially appealing to both Mathers; moreover, Cocceius' reputation as a typologist could hardly have escaped Nathaniel's attention, for Cocceius was sharply criticized by the Dutch Reformed Church for his highly individualistic interpretations. It is true, however, that Samuel Mather could have arrived at his typologically oriented view of the covenant independently of Cocceius; such a doctrine is implicit in Luther and Calvin and is central in such Puritan theologists as William Ames, as well as in much of New England writing. I have not been able to identify precise indebtedness of Mather to Cocceius, yet I think Patrick Fairbairn is incorrect when he asserts that Cocceius' influence as a typologist owes more "to his eminence generally as a commentator than to any distinctive peculiarity in his typological principles" (The Typology of Scripture, or The Doctrine of Types [Edinburgh: 1845-47], p. 10). As I show in my discussion, Cocceius' typological principles are significantly different from those of his predecessors.

[73] Cocceius' theology of the covenant is still appreciated by modern theologians; Karl Barth, for example, praises Cocceius' work. According to Barth, Cocceius saw that the covenantal relationship is not solely limited to the Old and New Testaments, but is a part of "the greater context of world-history, before which, and after which, there are other similar stages" (Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of Reconciliation [Edinburgh: 1956], IV, 56). By focusing upon biblical history as a single, unified event in human history, in Barth's view, Cocceius provided a means by which the concept of lex naturae could be incorporated within the Christian framework. For a recent study which appears to be indebted to this Cocceian

of what Cocceius says is quite traditional, and he utilizes the terminology conventionally associated with typological interpretation. Like the Reformers before him, Cocceius insists that there is not "more than one literal and historical sense in the Scriptures"; like the Reformers, he insists, however, that many passages have a "metaphoric or transferred meaning" and that the typical sense of scripture incorporates "both senses."[74] Like Calvin, and Tyndale before him, Cocceius interprets the "promises" of the Old Testament in a typological sense: "it was necessary," he says, "that the truth [of the New Testament] should correspond and accord" with the promises made through the Hebrew kings, priests, and prophets, for "types and images cannot lie."[75] Cocceius repeats Calvin's position that, because the people of Israel were still in their infancy, "it had not yet been given to Israel to look upon the glory of God with unveiled eyes, but that

---

position, see A. C. Charity, Events and Their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante (Cambridge: 1966).

[74] Summa Theologiae ex Scripturis Repetita (Geneva: 1662), p. 83. I cite from the second edition (1669) throughout this study. For translations of both the Summa Doctrinae and the Summa Theologiae, I am indebted to Professor Meiner Rheinhold, Professor of Classics, the University of Missouri.

[75] Summa Theologiae, pp. 384-385. Unless otherwise noted, subsequent page references refer to the Summa Theologiae.

they needed a veil of figures" (p. 559). Hence, the type is the "shaping and delineation of truth and piety, [and] in such a way that whatever we say or believe or do we refer to its most eminent authority" (p. 19). And, again following Tyndale, Luther, and Calvin, Cocceius interprets the Jewish ceremonies as types of the "sacraments of the covenant of grace," asserting that Christ, "who gave his benefits in them, [was] expressed and set forth, as it were, in types and figures. . . ."[76] Cocceius does not introduce either a new terminology or new typical identifications; unlike the Reformers, however, Cocceius brings together in one work the typical principles which are found scattered throughout the Reformers' works, providing the first unified statement of a theory of types in Protestant theologians.

In addition, Cocceius insists on a procedure which is only peripherally related to Calvin's typological interpretations and which had been condemned by Chrysostom and other Antiochenes; for Cocceius asserts that any interpretation of the type-antitype construct must begin with the parallels suggested by the antitype, proceeding then to "search out" the corresponding parallels in the type. Chrysostom had warned that interpreters must "not demand of the type all the exactness of the reality," for such a procedure encourages subjective and extravagant interpretations of Old Testament history.[77] This is the method which both Guild and Taylor occasionally employ in interpreting the significance of ceremonial observances: given a single, central parallel between Christ and the Paschal Lamb, for example, additional parallels are identified by using circumstances related to the Christian faith to isolate corresponding incidents in the Old Testament. And this is the source, as Chrysostom rightly indicates, of the Alexandrian extravagances; the result in Protestant and Puritan interpretations is the preoccupation with the minutia of Jewish ceremonial observances. Such strained identifications, however, are relatively few in the Reformers. Even in Guild and Taylor, ordinarily only the most obvious identifications are made, such as the Paschal Lamb, circumcision, the sacrifice of the scapegoat, and so on. In Mather, however, even the most minor ceremonies receive extended analysis. It seems likely that the source is in Cocceius and his doctrine of "prophesying."

---

[76] Summa Doctrinae, pp. 109-110.

Because of the centrality of the covenant in his theology, Cocceius insists that "it pleased God in sacred volumes through his servant Moses to record the entire doctrine of the covenant [of grace]." Following Calvin, Cocceius states that typology is the "key to understanding" the "interconnection and agreement of all parts" of Holy Scripture. Yet Cocceius insists, as Calvin does not, that the key itself must be interpreted, according to the "analogy of faith." Augustine had used St. Paul's phrase as a justification for allegorical interpretation; Cocceius, however, by viewing the phrase in its original context, relates the "analogy of faith" to the covenant of grace and to a method of biblical interpretation which he calls "prophesying." In writing to the church in Rome, Paul had urged the Christians there not to be "conformed to this world, but transformed by the renewing of your mind. . . ." All Christians, Paul continues, have a "gift of grace"; because of this gift, each member of Christ's body is enabled to perform the service to which he has been called:

---

[77] For my discussion of Chrysostom's statements, see above, pp. 121ff.

> Having gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the analogia of faith;
>
> Or ministery, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching;
>
> Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation. . . .[78]

According to Cocceius, this passage establishes a different gift of grace for the various services required of the members of Christ's body. Biblical exegesis necessitates a special grace, one which involves "erudition and training in the sacred languages and in the style of the holy men" (p. 76). The "neophyte or one having only a boy's thinking" is incapable of understanding "enigmas, parables, figures, and allegories which are not patent unless one has the key of understanding. . . ." Men trained in biblical exegesis are granted a special gift of grace by God to interpret scripture according to the "analogy of faith." In this manner, "those who show that the Evangel was previously promised in the Old Testament, prophesy" (p. 70).

---

[78] Romans 12: 6-8. Cocceius does not use any of the sixteenth or seventeenth century translations of this passage, which variously render analogy as "agreeing" (Tyndale), "proportion" (Geneva and KJV), or as "rule" (Rheims). He correctly renders the Greek term as "analogy."

Cocceius, therefore, creates a unique method of typological interpretation, relating a theory of types to the covenant of grace and to the select members of the church body who have been granted a special gift of prophesying. Such a position is related to the assertion of the medieval Church that only the ecclesiastical hierarchy possess the "keys" to the Scriptures. Cocceius, however, limits the "key to understanding" to a single hermeneutic method: typological interpretation. Moreover, he asserts that typology is not simply a method of viewing the Old Testament, but is the sole principle of interpretation to be applied to the New. "The Apostles," he says, "used the perpetual authority of the Old Testament, and . . . they declare that they taught nothing outside Moses and the prophets. . . ." And he continues:

> This is so true that if anyone dares to cast aside or neglect the Old Testament, one does injury to the very light of the New Testament, and does the same as if someone took out one of his eyes as not necessary. For then finally does the light of the New Testament clearly shine forth when not only is the story and doctrine of Christ supported by the measure of promise and prediction, but also when those things which in the entire body of sacred writings from whatever part of divine truth and the entire compass of mystery are said by all men of God to be in order and by analogy are compared with one another and connected and set forth with the solid demonstration of knowledge (p. 20).

The New Testament, then, contains the fulfillment of the "promise and prediction" of the Old Testament; more importantly, however, the new covenant is not seen in its full light until the "entire body of sacred writings" is viewed in relation to the analogy of faith. Typology is not only a key to understanding the Old Testament, but it is essential in determining the full import of the Gospel message. Hence, unlike any of his predecessors, Cocceius asserts that both testaments are only "shadows" of the truth until an interpreter, endowed with special grace, provides an "unveiling."

Quite apart from his statements in regard to covenant theology, it seems clear why Cocceius appealed to New England Puritans, for he provides theological justification for an educated ministry and a firm basis of support for ministerial authority. God's grace could not be obtained, of course, by man's efforts; yet His grace was essential to those who would interpret His word. Equally as essential, however, was a ministerial classis trained "in the sacred languages and in the style of the holy men," an educated group which, if recipients of God's unmerited favor, could "tell forth" from the New England pulpits the Word of God. William Ames's *The Arte of Prophesying*, for example, is not a study of the predictive function of Hebrew prophets, but of the preaching of the Word. Nor would Cocceius' theory of prophesying be lost on a Puritan typologist such as Samuel Mather, for the Cocceian theory of types "opened up" even the most obscure Old Testament passages, for even the New Testament itself could not be fully understood until the faith of the Christian dispensation was related to its typical counterparts in the Hebrew Scriptures. The tendency in Guild and Taylor to focus on ceremonial observances becomes in Mather somewhat of an obsession, for three-fourths of *The Figures or Types* is devoted to a minute analysis of the peculiarities of Jewish worship.[79] Moreover, the "analogy of faith" or, as Mather commonly phrases it, "express scriptural warrant," permits--even encourages--highly individualistic interpretations.[80]

---

[79] In his prefatory comments to *The Figures or Types* Nathaniel acknowledges this aspect of *his brother's work*: ". . . *There are some things wherein he departs from the Sentiments of some other learned and judicious Persons*.

The Figures or Types is the summa doctrinae of the history of typology; except for additional typical interpretations of minor Jewish ceremonies, there is very little in Mather's work which is new. In fact, his work is the clearest index to both Patristic and Protestant typological interpretations of any study before Fairbairn's work in the nineteenth century. Even in those instances where Mather does not explicitly acknowledge the source of his interpretations, the source is ordinarily easily identifiable.[81] Moreover, he asserts that he has studied the "whole body of typical renderings," and his text supports the assertion. Although it is unlikely that Mather knew

---

His making some of the old legal Ordinances Types of the instituted Church, and Ordinances under the New Testament and our Ordinances the Antitypes of theirs, it may be Some may not assent unto . . ." (p. iv).

[80] It is this aspect of the Cocceian system which Fairbairn most stringently criticizes, for it leaves "ample scope for the indulgence of a luxuriant fancy" (p. 11). This is not to say, however, that Mather's allegorical interpretations are in the Alexandrian mode. Even Mather's most unusual readings are explicitly confined to the historical framework of both testaments.

[81] Mather never refers to Augustine by name, yet in numerous instances, his debt to Augustine is clear. In his discussion of Jerusalem as the City of God and as a type of the Church, for example, he does little more than summarize Augustine's remarks (see The Figures or Types, pp. 328ff.).

such works as *Pictor in Carmine* and the *Biblia Pauperum*, even the types which he discusses that are not found in Luther, Calvin, Guild, or Taylor, had been previously identified by the Latin Fathers and are listed, with one exception, in *Pictor* and, with few exceptions, in the *Biblia*.[82] The same impulses which led to the extensive typical identifications in the Middle Ages also underlie Mather's work, although his immediate source is more likely the typical theory of Cocceius.[83] Most of Mather's citations from Patristic commentators are taken from the Greek Fathers; quite often, he uses an early Patristic citation to support a Puritan position, illustrating that, even in light of its own traditions, the Roman Church was corrupt. Both Justin Martyr and Chrysostom, for example, had condemned the use of musical instruments in church worship; Mather observes that even the Church's own authorities knew that the typical use of instruments in Jewish worship was abolished in the antitypical worship of the early church.[84] Although Mather invariably condemns Origenistic allegory, he is not reluctant to use even Origen's statements when they suit his purpose. In the *Contra Celsum*, for example, Celsus charges that Christian worship is bare and unadorned, and lacking in the physical beauty of Jewish liturgical services: Christians have "*neither Images*, *nor Altars*, *nor Temples*." Origen, Mather notes, "doth not deny the Charge, but confesseth the Matter of Fact to be true, and defends it from the very Fundamental Grounds of Religion . . ." (p. 373). Mather's use of Origen's statement is an invalid extension of Origen's

---

[82] In addition to the personal types listed in Guild and Taylor, Mather adds Eve, Seth, Lamech (Noah's father), Methuselah, Heber (the "father" of the Hebrews), Judah (son of Jacob), Hezekiah and Josiah (reforming Jewish kings), Elijah, and Cyrus, founder of Persia. With the exception of Cyrus, each of these figures is identified in *Pictor*; all but Seth, Methuselah, and Heber are represented in the *Biblia*. Mather occasionally modifies, however, Patristic interpretations, largely for doctrinal reasons. Eve, according to Mather, is not a type of the Virgin Mary, but of the Church.

[83] Cocceius' assertion that types must be interpreted and that typical parallels are identified by beginning with the antitypical event are central principles in Mather's approach, and are discussed in his preliminary statements. He asserts, for example, that there is a "*double use* of types," for they both "*darken* and *illustrate*": "If explained and understood, *they* do exceedingly enlighten and illustrate; but if not explained, they are like a Riddle, they cast a dark mist and cloud upon the whole thing" (p. 9). Mather makes clear that a knowledge of sacred languages and God's assistance (the two criteria Cocceius identifies) are necessary to a clear understanding. In addition, like Cocceius, Mather asserts that an understanding of types depends upon the analogy of faith and an identification of the antitypical significance: "When by comparing several Scriptures together, there doth appear *an evident and manifest* Analogy *and parallel between Things under the Law, and things under the Gospel*,

---

we may conclude, that such legal Dispensations were intended as *Types* of those Gospel Mysteries whose Image they bear. In such a case, *Res ipsa loquitur*. For the *Type* must be made like the *Antitype* . . ." (p. 54).

[84] See pp. 476ff. In this instance, Mather also cites Aquinas' statements against instrumental music in worship services.

purpose, for Mather cites the Contra Celsum to defend his assertion that the early church did not have altars, but a simple table on which the Lord's Supper was commemmorated. Ordinarily, however, Mather refers to Patristic commentators as examples of corrupt interpretations; Bellarmine, more than any other Latin Father, receives the harshest criticism, for Mather associates him with the "corrupt glosses" of the fifteenth century Vulgate. Yet, Mather is clearly knowledgeable of the typological studies of Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, Tertullian, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, Jerome, and Augustine.

It is Luther and Calvin, however, to whom Mather is most indebted.[85] Luther's use of the type-antitype construct is extensive, and because he is closer to the allegorical interpretations of the glossia than is Calvin,his criticism of them is more frequent. In a number of instances, when Mather attacks allegorical interpretations, he concludes his statements with the phrase, "As Luther saith. . . ," occasionally referring to a specific passage in one of Luther's commentaries. In discussing the "*Historical Verity*" of types, for example, Mather distinguishes between types and allegories and completes his comments with a sustained attack on the "Popish Interpreters," citing three separate passages from Luther's commentaries as support for his position. "Luther," Mather says, "called such Allegories *Spumam Scripturae*, they beat the Scriptures into Froth by allegorizing all things" (p. 130). Mather then identifies, in a marginal note, two passages in the Commentary on Genesis and one in the Commentary on Galatians in which Luther condemns Origenistic allegory. In the chapter titled "The Manifold sinfulness of Popish Holy-days," Luther stands at the head of a group of Protestant writers who had written against the celebration of Saints' days. Mather identifies Luther's *De Bonis Operibus*, "set forth *anno* 1520," which condemns all holy days except the Lord's Day; he then cites from Beza, a Reverend Mr. Dod, a certain Mr. Scobel, and Calvin's commentaries on Amos (pp. 473ff.). More often than not, however, Mather does not identify the specific source in Luther's work; Luther is simply cited in a general way as presenting the acceptable Protestant position. Mather's debt to Luther is extensive, as the citations make clear; ordinarily, however, he does not quote Luther's specific typical identifications, but only his comments on typical theory or his condemnation of the Latin Fathers and medieval glosses.[86]

---

[85] Mather makes no specific reference to Guild or Taylor, yet it seems likely that he is indebted to both. Guild's practice (also found in Taylor) of ending each discussion of typical parallels with a section pointing out the "disparitie" is invariably followed in Mather. Taylor's extensive categorizing and use of the sermon pattern are also characteristic of The Figures or Types. Whether Mather is specifically indebted to either man for these ideas cannot be determined; it seems unlikely, however, that he did not know of their work, for he cites from an extensive number of seventeenth century Protestant divines, and he seems to have identified nearly all of the typological statements in Calvin and Luther, as well as the early Fathers. One of the divines Mather cites from is Dr. Andrew Willet; although Mather gives no indication that he knew Willet's emblem book, Sacrorum Emblematum Centuria Una, he does cite from the commentaries on Genesis (p. 35). For my discussion of the Sacrorum, see above, pp. 204ff.

Calvin, on the other hand, is the single most important influence in The Figures or Types; for Mather returns to Calvin again and again, not only for central doctrinal statements, but for specific typical interpretations as well. In discussing the relationship between the Law and the Gospel, for example, Mather simply paraphrases Calvin's assertion that "figures and shadows" were ordained by God because of the "Infant-Age" of the church: "Children must have their A. B. C. weak and rudimental Instructions . . . , Like a Horn-book to a Child" (p. 62). In such cases, Mather ordinarily cites the specific source in Calvin which he paraphrases. Calvin's doctrine of "revelation by accomodation," for example, occurs in the Institutes, Book II, Chapters 11-12; it is in this section that Calvin first introduces the comparison of the Old Testament to a child's "primer." And it is this specific source which Mather acknowledges in a marginal note. Moreover, in developing one of his minor sub-points, Mather often makes a single assertion, moves on to the next subhead, and refers the reader to Calvin's work for a fuller development of the point at issue.[87] It is in regard to typical identifications, however, that Calvin's influence is most clearly seen. In discussing Joseph as a "personal" type, for example, Mather says that "it is true [that] Joseph is not so expresly mentioned in the New Testament as a Type of Christ, as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are; but the Analogy is so clear and full, that we cannot [but] well admit him" (p. 86). Mather then notes that Calvin had also identified Joseph as a type of Christ (in the Commentary on Matthew). According to Mather, Joseph types Christ in four ways: in his personal qualifications, in his sufferings, in his advancement, and in his "Carriage towards his Brethren." These four parallels, which Mather fully develops, are the ones which Calvin briefly mentions in his discussion of Matthew's statement, "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (2: 15). It is in Mather's typical analysis of the peculiarities of Jewish ritual, however, that Calvin's influence is most clearly seen. Characteristically, Mather extends a single statement in Calvin's commentaries to a full paragraph, or more. Calvin, for example, had identified the bells on the High Priest's robe as the "sweet sound of the Gospel." In Mather, the phrase becomes:

---

[86] One of the most striking characteristics of The Figures or Types is the almost total lack of doctrinal controversy. Mather, to be sure, defends particular doctrines central to Protestant thought, such as the number of sacraments, covenant theology, the doctrine of the Trinity, and so on. He also supports positions peculiar to Puritanism, such as condemning the use of instrumental music in church worship and the wearing of "popish" vestments. Yet, the central controversies which inform much of Luther's and Calvin's works are absent in Mather; as a result, Mather's writing lacks the intellectual intensity characteristic of the Reformers'.

---

[87] Mather asserts, for example, that the ceremonial laws of Judaism have typical significance, for they receive their authority from the Second Commandment, which is also binding on Christians. In Calvin's Harmony of the Four Books of Moses, this relationship is the subject of extensive discussion; Mather simply refers the reader to Calvin's "harmonising the Books of Moses" (p. 53).

> The Voice of Christ is the Gospel, which is heard of his Church, the sound thereof rings in his Church, yea throughout the world. . . . And we may apply it in a secondary way to the Ministers of Christ, those Antitypical priests. They should be furnished with Golden Bells, the voice of Prayer, and the voice of Preaching; as the Priests of old, if the noise of these Bells was not heard, they dye, Exod. 28.25. so it is spiritual death and destruction to the Soul: There is no hope of the Salvation of that Minister under the Gospel, that cannot, that doth not Pray and Preach . . . (p. 503).

This is not to say, however, that Mather accepts Calvin's statements indiscriminately. Calvin's conviction that each appearance of angels in the Old Testament always refers to the visitation of Christ in His role as Mediator is not Mather's position. Such a conception would have provided Mather, as it does Calvin, with an excellent method of demonstrating the typological relationships of the two covenants. Although Mather does not openly disagree with Calvin, in those instances which Calvin cites (the visit to Abraham, Jacob's ladder, the Old Testament ministrations of angels, and so on) as examples of Christ's appearance in the Old Testament in the guise of angels, Mather makes clear that the visitors were angels and nothing more.[88] Yet, in large part, The Figures or Types is Calvinistic typology "writ large."

Given the limitations which Protestant typologists impose upon their use of the typical event, little more than further elaboration could be added in studies subsequent to Mather's work.[89] Moreover, The Figures or Types is not a pioneering study; it simply reflects the extent to which typology dominated the Puritan ethos. Typology, for example, was expressly sanctioned in the New England "Confession of Faith":

---

[88] For example, see The Figures or Types pp. 81ff.; 130ff.; and 408ff.

[89] Keach, for example, does not discuss any types which do not appear in Mather; his work is much closer to Taylor's Moses and Aaron, from which he quotes a number of times (see Book IV, p. 434, for example). In fact, Keach primarily limits himself to a discussion of personal types, avoiding, except for such identifications as the Passover and the Paschal Lamb as types of Christ, an analysis of Jewish rituals. Tropologia is significant, however, for types are placed in relation to figurative expressions in the Bible, indicating that the central role which typology plays in the interpretations of the Reformers and the Puritans is beginning to be vitiated. For when types are discussed in connection with simile, metaphor, metonymy, synechdoche, catachresis, hyperbole, etc., as they are in Glassius' work and even in the "Treatise of Types" which Keach adds to the Philologia, they cease to be the primary key for interpreting the Old Testament and become only one of a number of figurative expressions contained in philologia sacra.

> Although the work of redemption was not actually wrought by Christ till after his incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy and benefits thereof, were communicated unto the elect in all ages successively from the beginning of the world, in and by those promises, types and sacrifices, wherein he was revealed and signified to be the seed of the woman, which should bruise the serpent's head, and the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, being yesterday and to day the same, and for ever.[90]

Typology appeared in the alphabet rhymes in the New England Primer. In the earliest extant edition only four rhymes could be called typological ("In Adam's Fall / We sinned all," "Job feels the rod, / Yet blesses God," "Young Obadias, / David, Josias, / All were pious," and "Samuel anoints / Whom God appoints"); by the turn of the century, the typical figures Elijah, Noah, Moses, and Jonah had been added to the list.[91] Christ's antitypical function as Prophet, Priest, and King comprises four question and answer series in the Shorter Catechism; typical references occur in sermons, in the logical treatises of

---

[90] Cited in Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History of New-England (New York: 1967), II, 189.

[91] See, for example, the representative plates reproduced in Clifton Johnson, Old-Time Schools and School-Books (New York: 1963), pp. 78ff. Each of the typical identifications which are visually represented in the Primer also appear in the Biblia Pauperum and the stained glass windows at Canterbury.

John Eliot, in the "Commonplace Book" of Joseph Green, in Michael Wigglesworth's diary, in Peter Bulkeley's elegy to Thomas Hooker, and in the sacramental symbols carved on New England tombstones.[92] In fact, five years before The Figures or Types, there is some evidence that, to one individual at any rate, there was a surfeit of types. In an elegy on the death of Jonathan Mitchell, a certain F. Drake speaks of types as a "convulsion of language":

> . . . The private friend
> O'erwhelm'd with grief, falter[s], his comforts end;
> By a warm sympathy let fev'rish heat
> Roam through my verse unseen; and a cold sweat
> Limning despair, attend me; signs diffuse
> Convulsions through my language, such as use
> To type a gasping fancy. . . .[93]

Yet, the traditions of typology had not yet received their single most poetic expression nor their most unique theological analysis. Such was to occur in the poetry of Edward Taylor and the private notebook of Jonathan Edwards.

---

[92] Sacvan Bercovitch ("The Williams-Cotton Controversy Reassessed") cites representative passages from these individuals (pp. 169ff.); for my discussion of tombstone imagery, see pp. 20ff.

[93] Quoted in Nathaniel Morton, New England's Memorial (Boston: 1826), p. 338.

CHAPTER IV

TYPOLOGY IN EDWARD TAYLOR AND JONATHAN EDWARDS

During the first three centuries of theological development, typology evolved from a relatively minor mode of relating Hebrew Scripture and Christian faith to a major hermeneutical concern: the limited typical identifications of New Testament authors were brought together and developed more fully in the second century by Justin Martyr in the *Dialogue with Trypho*; in the third century, utilizing Philonian allegory, Origen related the type-antitype construct to the three-fold method of scriptural interpretation, creating the extensive typical identifications of the *Contra Celsum*. Eusebius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Jerome contributed further elaborations; and, in the second decade of the fifth century, four centuries of typological traditions were summarized in Augustine's *Contra Faustum*, the last major typological treatise of the Church Fathers. In general terms, an analogous evolutionary process occurred, in slightly more than half a century, in the development of Puritan typology. Like the *Dialogue with Trypho*, William Guild's *Moses Unvailed* (1620) brings together the scattered references of the Reformers' works into a single study; like the Contra Celsum, Thomas Taylor's Moses and Aaron (1635) unites allegorical interpretation (in relation to Jewish rites) and typical identifications; and, like the Contra Faustum, Samuel Mather's The Figures or Types (1673) is a summation of the typological interpretations of previous centuries.

Characteristic of typological studies after Augustine, however, is the modification of traditional typology to reflect the individualistic readings of an interpreter, to express the particular vision of an artist, to support the doctrinal bias of an exegete, and so on. St. Bonaventure, for example, utilizes Exodus typology to express the stages of mystical illumination; medieval stained glass artists create new typical identifications to provide unified designs; and Calvin develops his doctrine of the Mediator to demonstrate that, after Christ's assumption of the priestly role, the priestly intermediary function is unnecessary.[1] As the history of typological development indicates, once the corpus of typical identifications is established, the introduction of new identifications and the modification of orthodox typology result inevitably.

---

[1] For my discussion of Bonaventure's mystical treatise, Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum, see above, pp. 144ff.; for an analysis of the relation of typical identification and artistic design, see pp. 147ff. Calvin's concept of the Mediator is presented in pp. 271ff.

Such is the case in the extravagant typical series in stained glass and in the extensive and strained parallels of Puritan interpretations of Jewish rituals. And such is the case in the typology of Edward Taylor and Jonathan Edwards: their use of the typical event is based upon the historical traditions of typology, yet both men modify these traditions in significant ways. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to illustrate briefly the relationship of Taylor and Edwards to Patristic and Protestant typology, subsequently indicating how both men, when they find the limited type-antitype construct restrictive, move beyond traditional typology to a broader, yet still Puritan, point of view.

The clearest index to Taylor's knowledge of typological traditions is found in the twenty-two extant sermons, the eight sermons called a Treatise Concerning the Lord's Supper, preached from November of 1693 to March of 1694,[2] and the fourteen sermons titled the Christographia, preached from August of 1701 to October of 1703.[3] In the first group, for example, minor typical identifications appear in every sermon; the incidental way in which Taylor refers to types and in which he uses typical terminology indicate that typology was a part of the common usage of his sermons.[4] In Sermon I, Taylor refers to the Jewish ceremonies which prefigured the Lord's Supper in "a dull and dark typical way" (p. 10); in Sermon II, he asserts that the Lord's Supper is no "converting ordinance" because the typical ceremonies in the Old Testament were restricted to members of the Jewish faith (pp. 41ff.); in Sermon III, he relates God's call of the Old Testament typical figures to a covenantal relationship to the Christian's call to come to the "wedden supper"; and so on. It is in the fourth sermon, the central one of the series, however, that Taylor's use of typology is most extensive. The primary purpose in the eight sermons of the Treatise is to refute Solomon Stoddard's assertion that the Supper may be used as a means of conversion, and therefore should be "open" to all men, whether they are members of the Church or not.[5] Taylor is rigidly opposed to Stoddard's position, and in Sermon IV he assembles an array of typical identifications to refute Stoddard's practice. "The Passover, sacrifices, offerings, etc.," Taylor asserts, following every Protestant typologist, "were not erected

---

[2] Edward Taylor's Treatise Concerning the Lord's Supper, ed. Norman S. Grabo (Lansing, Michigan: 1965). Subsequent page numbers refer to this edition. For Grabo's discussion of the dates of the sermons, see his "Introduction," pp. liv-lv.

[3] Edward Taylor's Christographia, ed. Norman S. Grabo (New Haven: 1962). Subsequent page numbers refer to this edition.

---

[4] The year 1693/94 is the crucial period in Taylor's use of the typical event. There are no clear typical identifications in the long poem, God's Determinations Touching His Elect, composed apparently in the early 1680's; in the forty-nine Meditations (First Series), composed between July, 1682, and February, 1692, I find only one rather obscure reference to the Ark of the Covenant as a type of Christ. (See The Poems of Edward Taylor, ed. Donald E. Stanford [New Haven: 1960], Meditation 33, p. 53. Subsequent page references to Taylor's poetry refer to this edition.)

It is not until 1693 that Taylor began to make extensive use of typology. The fourth sermon of the Treatise ("Preacht 18th: 12m: 1693/4"), the longest one in the series, is based upon a specifically stated theory of types. Moreover, the Second Series of Meditations, which begins probably in May or August of 1693, initiates a unit of some sixty Meditations based exclusively upon typology (from Meditation 1 to Meditation 114, August, 1713), extending over a period of ten years. As I demonstrate in this chapter, Norman Grabo, who identifies "twenty-odd poems on typology" (see Edward Taylor [New Haven: 1961], pp. 141-142), and Louis L. Martz, who extends the number to "the thirty meditations on 'Types' that begin the second series" (see the "Foreword" to Stanford's edition of the Poems, p. xxi), are incorrect. Meditation 47, for example, appears to be a comment on Christ as the "well of living waters." It is, in fact, based upon the typical identification of the brazen laver in the Temple as a type of baptism, an identification quite common in Puritan typologists. See, for example, Samuel Mather, The Figures or Types (London: 1673), who identifies the "sea of brass" as a "spiritual washing in the Blood of Jesus Christ" (pp. 379ff.). Moreover, in light of the history of typology, Taylor's identification of the laver is explicit in the first two stanzas:

. . . Musing upon Almighties Mighty ALL
In all its Fulness socketed in thee
As furniture, my Lord, to grace thy Hall . . .

I strike mine oare not in the golden Sea . . . ,
But in the Silver Ocean . . . (p. 166).

[5] For a discussion of the conflict between Taylor and Stoddard, see Grabo's introduction to the Treatise, "The Poet versus the Pope: Stoddardeanism," pp. xixff.

as means of converting . . . in their celebration" (p. 73).

> . . . All sacrifices were types of Christ, and the celebration of them a covenanting with God in Christ, and signs and seals of our reconciliation to God in Christ, and of our . . . [cleaving] to and living upon Christ by faith in Christ typified. Hence surely they should not be means begetting that whereof they are the signs (p. 74).

Not content to include only the sacrifices in his statement, Taylor further asserts that "other seals, whether types or antitype, were never ordained converting ordinances . . ." (p. 98); circumcision, typifying baptism, the Passover, typifying the Supper, are "seals of the covenant" which follow upon conversion and are not to be used before it: "God ordered that no uncircumcised person should eat the Passover, so no unbaptized person is to come to the Lord's Supper" (p. 103). Near the close of the sermon, in a long passage, Taylor explicitly states a theory of types which is identical to the theory of Luther and Calvin, William Guild, Thomas Taylor, Samuel Mather, and Benjamin Keach--it is the orthodox creed of Protestant typology:

> These carnal ordinances [Jewish ceremonies] were shadows and types of spiritual things. But as to the gospel dispensation, it is not so. The dispensation is wholly spiritual. The substance shadowed out by the type constitutes our gospel dispensation. As then the shadow or type accepted of a ceremonial or typical holiness, as sufficient for the constitution of its visible church state, and so to churchhood, calling to no higher holiness as absolutely necessary; the seal of the covenant, or Passover, acquiesseth in such a qualified subject.

> So now, the substance, or thing typified, a typified or real holiness, is essential to the constituting of a visible church state. And so the seal of the covenant now, or the Lord's Supper will not necessarily follow, to be converting, though it should be supposed that the Passover was administered to unconverted ones. For in this very respect you have the subject of the old dispensation brought in as opposed in qualifications to those under the new (Jer. 31:32, 33, 34): "I will make a new covenant with them not according to the covenant that I made with them when I brought them out of the land of Egypt. But this shall be the covenant: I will write my laws in their hearts, and put them in their inward parts," etc. Hence it's rational to conclude that the cleanness required in the subject of the typical Passover was a type of the real holiness in the subject of the typified Passover, the Lord's Supper (p. 128).

As this passage reveals, Stoddard's innovations, from Taylor's point of view, were not simply the result of "drifting" from the New England way; they struck at the heart of Protestant theology: the relationship between the Old and New Testaments as it is symbolized in the covenant. Seen in this light, Taylor's refutation is simply not theological quibbling; it is a defense of 200 years of Protestant thought.

In the course of his argument, Taylor cites an impressive array of Patristic and Protestant commentators to support his position:

> . . . Clemens [Clement of Alexandria], Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Augustine, Chrysostom, Beda, Albinus, etc., Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Bullinger, Bucer, Beza, Zwinglius, etc., Cranmer, Ridley, Philpot, Rogers, Rowland Taylor, Hooper, and the rest of those godly martyrs . . . (p. 125).

The Patristic commentators are called "stars of the first magnitude in the orb of the gospel ministry," and Taylor demonstrates an intimate knowledge of their writings. The sources of many of the typical identifications in the poetry can not be identified; in the *Treatise* and *Christographia*, however, Taylor cites from and identifies nearly all of the major Patristic typological studies. The identifiable titles in what remains of his library reveal an unusual interest in typological commentators of the first five centuries;[6] moreover, as the citations indicate, he had access to such works as Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, even though the only work of Justin's in Taylor's extant library is the *Second Apology . . . for Christians*.[7] In addition, Taylor makes no distinction between the Antiochenes and the Alexandrians: he cites from St. Basil's most typologically oriented treatise, *De Baptismo*, from Theodoret's *Ecclesiasticae Historiae*, which is organized

---

[6] For a complete list of Taylor's library, see *The Poetical Works of Edward Taylor*, ed. Thomas H. Johnson (Princeton, New Jersey: 1966), pp. 204-222.

[7] In Sermon IV of the *Treatise*, for example, Grabo has identified a reference to the *Dialogue with Trypho* (see p. 223, n9). Taylor also possessed a copy of Matthew Poole's *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque de scripturae interpretum* (Amsterdam: 1669-1676), 5 vols., a learned collection of annotations and treatises on the Bible. As Grabo demonstrates, however, Taylor's citation is not taken from Poole, but from the *Dialogue*, which is not among what remains of Taylor's library.

(as is Jonathan Edwards' History of Redemption) around the major typical figures of the Old Testament, Chrysostom's commentaries on Romans and Philippians and his Homily on Romans;[8] citations from the Alexandrians include Clement's typologically oriented Stromata and Paedogogus, Tertullian's major hermeneutic treatise, De Anima, references to typology in Jerome, Gregory, and, most importantly to Origen and Augustine. In fact, the two Church Fathers "most loyally and frequently cited by Taylor" are Origen and Augustine.[9] Taylor owned a complete set of Augustine's works; he continually cites from them in reference to general doctrinal positions, and from the Contra Faustum itself in relation to specific typical interpretations. Moreover, Taylor is obviously familiar with Augustine's statements regarding the four-fold level, a method of interpretation which Taylor rejects. In Meditation 131, for example, Taylor presents an interpretation of Canticles 6: 6, "Thy Teeth are like a flock of Sheep that come up from washing whereof every one bears twins," one of the texts which Augustine had used to illustrate the four-fold method. In Stanzas 5-6, Taylor presents various previous interpretations, subsequently rejecting each one and presenting his own. "Some" interpreters, Taylor notes, have interpreted the "Teeth" as the Church Militant; "others do say they note Christ's ministers." In "On Christian Doctrine," Augustine's major statement of hermeneutical principles, the "teeth" are interpreted as "Christ's ministers":

---

[8] There is evidence to suggest that Taylor also knew the Homily on I Corinthians, in which occurs Chrysostom's comparison of types to a painter's rude sketch. In Sermon IX of the Christographia, for example, Taylor distinguishes between the shadow of types and the substance of the antitype in the same terms which Chrysostom uses: "God doth as it were pensill out in fair Colours and ingrave and portray Christ" in the type. In Meditation 50 (Second Series), the Meditation corresponding to Sermon IX, the dominating metaphor is of God the Artist whose typical prefigurations "lay'd in inke Divine / Of Promises, of a Prophetick Shade . . ." (p. 265). Unless otherwise noted, subsequent citations to the Meditations refer to the Second Series.

[9] Grabo, Treatise, p. 223, n1.

> . . . I feel greater pleasure [Augustine says] in contemplating holy men, when I view them as the teeth of the Church, tearing men away from their errors, and bringing them into the Church's body. . . .[10]

Taylor, however, asserts that "These Teeth import true faith in Christ alone / And Meditation on the Gospell . . ." (p. 333), explicitly rejecting Augustine's view.

Surprisingly enough, however, it is Origen to whom Taylor is most indebted for specific typological interpretations. A 600 page manuscript book, apparently bound by

---

[10] For my discussion of this statement in relation to Augustine's comments on the four-fold level, see above, pp. 129ff.

Taylor, contains translations of Origen's De Principiis and the Contra Celsum in Taylor's handwriting. Taylor may have first been introduced to Origen in Poole's Synopsis, for he cites brief passages from the Homilies, and from the commentaries on Numbers, Leviticus, Matthew, and Romans. Sometime before 1693, however, he must have obtained copies and made his translations of Origen's major statement of hermeneutical principles, De Principiis, and his most extensive typological study, Contra Celsum.[11] In light of the Reformers' universal condemnation of Origen as the source of allegorical interpretation and the corruption of the medieval glosses, it is difficult to explain Taylor's extensive citations from Origen's works and his obvious interest in, and approval of, many of Origen's interpretations: none of Taylor's comments in relation to Origen himself or to his works is pejorative. Taylor's demonstrable knowledge of Calvin's Institutes and the condemnation which Calvin makes of Origen's methods and interpretations could hardly have gone unnoticed by Taylor; yet he is apparently unmoved by Calvin's judgment, a judgment which is even more vehement in Luther, and which Taylor must have also known.

---

[11] For a discussion of the manuscript book, see Francis X. Murphy, "An Edward Taylor Manuscript Book," American Literature (May, 1959), XXXI, 188-189.

It is possible that Taylor was initially attracted to Origen because of his Christological doctrine, a doctrine which was the primary reason for Origen's condemnation as an heretic by the Justinian Council.[12] Origen, for example, is the first Christian exegete to use the term theanthropos to describe the connecting link between the infinite Logos, which preexisted before time in the Godhead, and the finite body of Christ. By analogy, Origen implies that the relation which Christ establishes with the mystical body, His Church, partakes of the same essence. Origen's statements occur in De Principiis; Taylor, in the second sermon of the Christographia series, defends Origen's Christology, which had been criticized, as Taylor notes, by St. Jerome. Jerome, according to Taylor, misreads Origen's De Principiis, from which Taylor cites throughout the sermon. Moreover, in Meditation 44, which is related to Sermon III of the Christographia (preached six weeks later), Taylor uses John 1: 14, "The Word was made flesh," as an antitypical counterpart to "Jacob's golden Ladder": for according to Taylor, the "ladder" is a type of the human and divine natures of Christ, or, as Taylor expresses it in Origen's terminology, theanthropie:

---

[12] For a summary of the actions of the Council, see Johannes Quasten, Patrology: The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus (Westminster, Maryland: 1962), II, 42ff. Quasten also summarizes the main tenets of Origen's Christology (pp. 79ff.).

> Things styld Transcendent, do transcende the Stile
>   Of Reason, reason's stares neere reach so high.
> But Jacob's golden Ladder rounds do foile
>   All reasons Strides, wrought of THEANTHROPIE.
>   Two Natures distance-standing, infinite,
>   Are Onifide, in person, and Unite (p. 161).

It seems likely that Taylor was first attracted to Origen's Doctrine of the Person of Christ, and only secondly to Origen's typology. It is certain, however, that Taylor adopted typical identifications which occur in the Contra Celsum, but which do not occur in any Protestant typological study. In Meditation 58, three times as long as any other Meditation, Taylor presents a capsule history of Exodus typology; stanzas 15-16 develop imagery which is found only in Alexandrian exegetes, and, developed as fully as Taylor develops it, only in Origen.[13] In both

---

[13] The stanzas are as follows:

> Isra'l to Elim Comes. Sweet joyes here findes
>   Twelves Springs of Water Every tribe a Well,
> And Seventy Palm trees fruitfull to their minde
>   A type that might things past, and future tell.
>   Twelve Patriarchs the wells they sprung from so,
>   And Seventy Elders that from them did flow.
>
> So here the Soule in Christ at Twelve wells, drinks
>   Of Living waters, twelve Apostles shewd
> Dates bore by seventy Palms set at their brinks
>   The Seventy disciples, are this food.
>   The Holy Scriptures, and Christs Doctrine are
>   Waters these Wells, and Dates these Palm trees
>   bare (p. 184).

For a discussion of the evolution of these types in Alexandrian commentators, see Jean Daniélou, From Shadows to the Christographia and in several typical Meditations, Taylor is clearly indebted to Origen, and in no instance does he suggest that Origen's works are not completely orthodox.[14]

Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers (Westminster, Maryland: 1960), pp. 172-174.

[14] I am not implying that Taylor did not publish his poetry because it contained unacceptable doctrinal statements. Ursula Brumm asserts that the Meditations contain the "first steps of a symbolic world interpretation, which actually was not intended by him [Taylor], and which does not coincide with his convictions" (see Die Religiöse Typologie im Amerikanischen Denken [Leyden: 1963], p. 50). Although Miss Brumm limits her statements to "a kind of allegorical interpretation of the Bible, which was condemned by Puritans as Catholic-Medieval" (p. 50), she implies that such a mode was "unorthodox" and, hence, could not have been made public. She further suggests that Taylor's contemporaries would have condemned his "radical spiritualizing [in the poetry] as the latest form of idolatry" (p. 72). Apart from the implication of Taylor's dishonesty, which every known fact of his life refutes, Miss Brumm does not take into account the numerous allegorical interpretations of Canticles which were quite orthodox to New England Puritans. John Cotton's A Brief Exposition . . . Upon the Whole Book of Canticles (London: 1655) is only one of an extensive list of such works. Richard Sibbes, Henry Ainsworth, George Wither, John Weemes, Theodore Beza, Thomas Wilcox, Nehemiah Rogers, to name only a few "orthodox" divines, published interpretations of Canticles which are no more "radical" in their "spiritualizing" than Taylor's later Meditations. (For an excellent analysis of seventeenth century allegorical interpretations of Canticles, see Stanley Stewart, The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry [Madison, Wisconsin: 1966].)

Moreover, it should be pointed out, that such allegorical interpretations and citations from Origen occur in Taylor's sermons as well as his poetry; given the theological sophistication of New England parishioners, it seems doubtful that unorthodoxy in the pulpit would have escaped notice. And Taylor has never been accused of being an

Beyond Taylor's obvious agreement with certain Protestant typical positions, which have their source in Calvin and Luther, it is unclear as to whether he knew such specific typological works as Guild's Moses Unvailed, Thomas Taylor's Moses and Aaron, and Mather's Figures or Types: the use of typological imagery is so widespread by the end of the seventeenth century that a specific source, other than those citations clearly identified in the sermons, is difficult to isolate. In addition, more than any other typologist, Taylor had a keen eye for visual imagery, particularly images associated with weaving and tapestry. His family may have been associated with the weaving industry near Sketchley, Leicestershire, England; or, at least, Taylor was impressed by the industry in the town. Visual images related to weaving, tactile response to different kinds of cloth, and a sharp sense of artistic

---

unorthodox preacher. The sermons, of course, are not as personal as the poetry, nor would one expect them to be. So far as I know, however, no one has suggested that Taylor did not publish because, mundane as it sounds, he could not afford the time nor the money. Westfield was a long distance from Boston; any publishing venture would have had to be initiated there, and a busy pastor would find it difficult to leave his duties for any length of time. Moreover, for a man who had laboriously to copy out by hand books which he wanted for his library, the cost of publishing several hundred pages of poetry, small though it may have been, may still have been prohibitive. (For a convenient summary of the various critical attitudes toward Taylor's "refusal" to publish, see Willie T. Weathers, "Edward Taylor and the Cambridge Platonists," American Literature [March, 1954], XXVI, 30ff.)

design and color pervade the Meditations. If he did indeed attend Cambridge, he would have had the opportunity to see the complex series of typological stained glass windows in King's College Chapel; in any case, he could hardly have escaped seeing typical representations in stained glass. It is quite likely that Taylor's extensive use of the image of "pipes" is related to a design quite common in stained glass. In the east window of the Corona at Canterbury, for example, Christ, seated in Glory, sends his "spirit" to the Apostles (represented directly below) through twelve bright red "pipes," lead strips surrounding brightly colored red glass.[15] It is also clear that Taylor had some knowledge of medieval manuscripts and typical symbolism; in Meditation 6, for example, he refers to an ornately ornamented cover of such a manuscript: "I spy thyselfe, as Gold Bosses fixt / On Bible Covers, shine in Types out bright . . ." (p. 90). At any rate, he could not have escaped acquaintance with typological imagery, either in Old or New England. Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that Taylor knew Guild's and Mather's studies of typology. In Meditation 114, for example, Taylor identifies the morning star as a type of Christ, the same identification which Guild makes in the first paragraph of *Moses Unvailed*.[16] In Sermon IX of the *Christographia*, Taylor identifies Cyrus, founder of Persia, as a "pagan" type of Christ, an identification which is unique in Samuel Mather.[17] Apart from his extensive use of Origen, Taylor's typology is quite traditional, and well within the framework of Protestant typical theory. It is also possible that, by the end of the seventeenth century, allegorical interpretations had become so much a part of Protestant thought, and the rejection of Scholastic allegorizing had been so complete, that Origen's typical identifications, used with discretion, were tolerated, if not accepted.[18]

---

[15] See Bernard Rackham, The Ancient Glass of Canterbury Cathedral (London: 1949), p. 83. Such representations, as Rackham notes, were commonplace in medieval iconography.

---

[16] William Guild, *Moses Unvailed; or Those Figures which Served unto the patterne and shaddow of heavenly things* (London: 1620), p. A5. Taylor's knowledge of Guild is not essential to this identification, however, for Meditation 114 is based on Revelations, 22: 16: "The bright and morning Star." Such an identification is quite conventional in numerous Protestant commentaries on Revelations, as it was in medieval commentaries.

[17] *The Figures or Types*, p. 116.

[18] In 1661, for example, a defense of Origen's Christology was issued, anonymously, by George Rust, entitled *A Letter of Resolution Concerning Origen and the Chief of His Opinions* (London). Moreover, Bellarmine, whose *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei* (1581-83) constituted a major defense of Catholic doctrine and contained very pointed criticism of Protestant "heresies," became the major object of Protestant attack. Samuel Mather is more vehement in his criticism of Bellarmine than Origen; and Taylor, in Sermon XI of the *Christographia*, condemns Bellarmine's Christology (see Grabo, pp. 487-488, n10).

Except for Sermon IV of the Treatise and Sermon IX of the Christographia, Taylor's use of typology in the sermons is only incidental to the main doctrine being analyzed. Sometime in the summer or early fall of 1693, however, Taylor conceived of a series of Meditations organized exclusively around typical identifications; Meditation 1 of the Second Series defines his theory of types, and the next sixty Meditations present a typical history of the Old Testament. The series extends, with only one or two interruptions, from May or August of 1693 to Meditation 63, dated February, 1704. During the following decade, typical identifications frequently occur in various Meditations, although only ten or eleven poems are structured solely around the type-antitype construct. After Meditation 114 (dated August, 1713), however, none of the remaining Meditations utilizes typical imagery, except in an incidental way, and then only rarely.[19] Taylor's decision to present a poetical study of typology, Ursula Brumm suggests, may have been prompted by Mather's work, or by some similar study (p. 56), for Taylor generally follows the order of types presented in The Figures or Types. That Taylor's decision to create a new series of Meditations making explicit use of the typical event was conscious, is suggested by the fact (as Miss Brumm notes) that there is no break between the First and Second Series. Moreover, whether or not Taylor follows Mather's order, which itself is based upon the chronological sequence of the Old Testament, Meditation 1 is an invocation for God's help in interpreting the shadowy character of the types:

---

[19] I do not discuss the later Meditations in the Second Series because they are not specifically related to typological interpretation. Beginning with Meditation 62, Taylor moves to an extended allegorical interpretation of Canticles; nearly all of the Meditations from 116 to the end of his life are based upon texts from Canticles, and develop a poetic allegory of the "Song of Songs." In general terms, therefore, the Second Series contains two major units: typological and allegorical interpretations.

> Oh! that I had but halfe an eye to view
> This excellence of thine [the glory of types], undazled: so
> Therewith to give my heart a touch anew
> Untill I quickned am, and made to glow.
> All is too little for thee; but alass
> Most of my little all hath other pass (p. 83).

In addition, Meditation 1 is a proem in which Taylor enunciates the subsequent concern of the series: the "Shaddows of things to come."[20]

---

[20] Contrary to Stanford's assertion that the poems are based on the "Doctrine" of the sermons, and that they are written after the fact, Meditation 1, correctly read as an annunciation of the theme of the series, may suggest that Taylor's plan was to base the communion sermons (delivered approximately at six week intervals) on a predetermined typical order. It seems unlikely that Taylor, who had to prepare five additional sermons between the Meditations, would wait until after the sermon had been delivered to begin composition of the poem. Moreover, since the typical series extends with only one or two interruptions over a period of more than ten years, it is

It is likely, however, that the impetus for initiating a new series of Meditations came not from Mather's work or a similar study, but from the actions of Solomon Stoddard. In the first three sermons of the Treatise, for example, typical identifications are a very minor part of the total focus of each sermon. In Sermon IV, however,

---

possible that the "Doctrine" Taylor refers to is a "doctrine of types," and not the doctrine of the sermon, as Stanford maintains.

In addition, Robert M. Benton's assertion that the sermon "texts form the basis . . . of the poems" seems untenable in light of the extensive typological scheme (see "Edward Taylor's Use of His Text," American Literature [March, 1967], XXXIX, 32). Quite often, Taylor's typical identifications have only the most tenuous relationship to the text cited as the headnote for the poem. In Meditation 47, for example, the text, "The Son hath life in himself" (John 5: 26), has no relation to the typical identification which provides the dominant image of the poem: the brazen laver in the Temple. Further, Taylor occasionally has two poems dealing with the same type, yet the text for each Meditation is different. Meditation 7, for example, clearly identifies Joseph as the typical figure presented in the poem: "He sent a man before them, even Joseph, who was sold etc." (Psalms 105: 17). Yet, Meditation 8, which continues the parallels of Meditation 7, does not mention Joseph specifically, and is based on Romans 5: 8: "God commends his love unto us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Even in Sermon IX of the Christographia, which corresponds to Meditation 50, Taylor's interpretation of John 1: 14 ("Full of Truth") is somewhat obscure unless one recognizes that the phrase is commonly associated in typological studies with the contrast between the "shadows" of the types and the "fullness" of the antitype. In view of the fact that so few sermons are extant, and hence the evidence must remain inconclusive, it would seem best to acknowledge that the poems might have been composed before or after the sermon was preached, and that they may or may not have been closely related to the sermon text.

preached at the height of the controversy with Stoddard, Taylor extensively utilizes typology in the course of his argument; for Taylor apparently saw that typical theory could be used to refute Stoddard's contention that the Supper was a converting ordinance. Meditation 1, written some time in the fall of 1693, states Taylor's intention to begin a typologically oriented series; by the fall of the next year, when Taylor had completed the sermons which are collected in the Treatise, he had already devoted nine Meditations to typical subjects. Underlying these first Meditations, and subsequent ones as well, is the unique characteristic of Taylor's use of typology: all types, as he says in the Christographia, are designed with the sole purpose of glorifying Christ:

> . . . Now then, put all the glory of all the Prophesies, Promises, and Types together, and what a glory is there. Yet all this comes upon Christ, who is the glory of them all and [they] are no more, if compared to his glory, than the light of a Candle to the Shining Sun. Well then how glorious must Christ bee? O wonderfull glorious (p. 283).

Types, by heightening the glory of Christ, inevitably call attention to man's insufficiency; moreover, each typologically oriented poem is written in relation to Taylor's administration of the Lord's Supper, further emphasizing the holiness of the sacrament and man's unworthiness. What began as a means of refuting Stoddard ultimately became the most extensive and personal expression of the sacramentum in Puritan, and perhaps Protestant, thought.

Unlike most typological "studies," however, Taylor's use of the type-antitype construct changes in significant ways during the decade he organizes the more than sixty poems around typical identifications, resulting finally in a movement from typical poetry to an extended poetic allegory of the Song of Songs. Such allegorical interpretation still remains within the framework of Puritan orthodoxy, yet Taylor ultimately found, as had the medieval artists before him, that the typical event was too restrictive for artistic expression; and, like medieval artists, Taylor found the relatively freer mode of allegory more congenial as a basis for his Meditations. Meditation 9 ("The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet") is an investigation of the typical characteristics of Moses; in the light of typological traditions, Taylor adds nothing new to the parallels between Moses and Christ. As is his early practice, Taylor devotes the first two stanzas to establishing his theme and to a confession of his own unworthiness:

> Lord, let thy Dazzling Shine refracted fan'de
>   In this bright Looking Glass, its favour lay
> Upon mine Eyes that oculated stand
>   And peep thereat, in button moulds of clay.
>   Whose glory otherwise that Courts mine eye
>   Will all its sparkling family destroy (p. 95).

The "bright Looking Glass" appears to be a reference to St. Paul's phrase, "now we see in a glass darkly"; in the second stanza, however, Taylor identifies the "glass": "Moses is made the Looking glass: in which / Mine Eyes to spie thee in this Type I pitch." Moses as the "glass" from which Christ's glory is reflected is a typological commonplace, appearing in Calvin, Luther, Guild, Thomas Taylor, and Mather. It is further related to the "unvailing" of Moses by the coming of Christ, to Calvin's conception (followed by subsequent commentators) that the Hebrews were incapable of apprehending God in His full glory, and to the conventional comparison of the "shadows" of the types to the full and "Dazzling Shine" of the antitype. Each succeeding stanza presents parallels between Moses and Christ which are the stock-in-trade of previous commentators: Stanza 3 compares the "Poor Parents," the persecution by an evil ruler, the miraculous delivery from persecution, and the righteous training of Moses and Christ. Stanza 4 identifies both as "Meeke, Courageous, Faithfull, Wise," and as obedient sons who render their parents "faithfull service." Moses' wife, according to Taylor, was a "gentile," or at least a non-Jew, and so is Christ's "Spouse," the Church, comprised primarily of Gentiles. And, finally, both men were "Mediators" of God's covenant. The following stanzas present further typological commonplaces: Moses led his people from bondage, as does Christ; Moses created the brazen serpent to save the Israelites from pain, as Christ's sacrifice rescues His people from the pain of death; both men fasted forty days and nights, both men delivered a "Law" to their followers, both men confirmed their offices by "signs and wonders," and so on. As this brief summary suggests, Taylor is not controlling his material, but being controlled by it. The poem is a weak one, for he is obviously bound by the wealth of typological tradition which, apparently, he feels must be presented in the poem. As a poeticized version of the same parallels presented by Guild or Mather, the poem is a striking index to the traditions of typology; as poetry, it is unsuccessful.

On the other hand, as subsequent Meditations reveal, Taylor was also conscious of his failure to control his material; for during the next decade he begins to limit the number of parallels he identifies, developing only those which he feels are significant, and often devoting two or three Meditations to a single typical parallel.[21] Meditations 36, 37, and 38, for example, develop the typical relationships between Moses as the head of the "Church" in the Old Testament and Christ as the head of the New Church. In Meditation 9, Taylor presents, in relation to the typical identification of Moses, all of

---

[21] The typical identifications which occur in the Second Series are as follows (the number in parenthesis refers to the particular Meditation in which the parallels are developed): a definition of types (1); the first-born (2); Adam (3); Abraham (4); Isaac (5); Jacob (6); Joseph (7, 8); Moses (9); Joshua (10); Samson (11); David

---

(12); Solomon (13); Prophets, Priests, and Kings (14); Nazarites (15); Jesse's Root (16); Sin-offerings (17); the Altar of Perfume (18); the Table of Shew-Bread (19); Tabernacle-Temple (20); Holy Days (21); the Passover (22); Aaron (23); the Feast of the Booths (24); the daily sacrifice of the lamb (25); the sacrifice of the red heifer and doves (26); cleansing of the leper (27, 28); Noah's ark (29); Jonah (30); the Tree in Paradise (31, 32); Eden (33); Christ the Head (36, 37, 38); first-born from the dead (39); Jacob's Ladder (44); the brazen laver (47); the Altar of Incense (49); Promises, Prophesies, and Types (50); the golden trumpets in the Temple (52); the function of Prophets, Priests, and Kings (54); a full summary of Exodus typology (58); the wilderness Cloud (59); Manna (60, version A); the Rock (60, version B); the brazen serpent (61); Solomon's Garden (63); circumcision (70); the Paschal Lamb (71); Joseph in the pit (78); the Altar of Sacrifice (82); Jerusalem (97, 98, 99, 100); the covenant as type (102, 103); the Morning Star (114). More than likely, those Meditations in the first sixty or so which I have been unable to identify (Meditations 34, 35, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56, and 62) are also structured around typical identifications; Taylor's identifications, particularly in Meditations 60ff., are often quite cryptic. Even in Meditation 40, for example, which is a lament on the death of Taylor's son James, the language and the occasion suggest that the typical identification underlying the poem is Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac.

All of Taylor's typical identifications had been previously made in Patristic or Protestant commentators; the only ones which do not occur in Samuel Mather, for example, are Joseph in the pit as a type of Christ's death, and the Morning Star as a type of Christ's Resurrection. The former identification, however, occurs in Patristic commentators, appearing also in the Biblia Pauperum (see Biblia pauperum, ed. H. Th. Musper [Munich: 1961], Plate 27); Guild also interprets the Morning Star in a typical sense.

the major Exodus types. Ten years later, however, in Meditations 59, 60 [A], 60 [B], and 61, he devotes a complete Meditation to the Cloud, the Manna, the Rock, and the Brazen Serpent, all of which were dealt with in a single stanza in 1694. Moreover, even in the later Meditations which are ordinarily devoted to a single type, it is Taylor's intense commitment to the sanctity and mystery of the Supper which dominates the poems, and not the initial typical identification. In the first Meditations of the Second Series, a relatively rigid structural pattern is observed: the poems begin with two stanzas of invocation and enunciation of theme, develop typical identifications through four or more central stanzas, and conclude with two stanzas of personal supplication. In these early Meditations, Taylor carefully excludes from the central or "doctrinal" portion of the poem, any personal involvement. Meditation 9, for example, is representative of this approach. Yet, increasingly in subsequent Meditations, Taylor directly and explicitly involves himself in the typical meaning of the poem; types cease to be historical phenomena and become reflections of his own spiritual state. In Meditation 49, the identification of the Altar of Incense as a type of Christ's intercessory office is the major typological image; unlike earlier Meditations, each stanza alternates between the glowing fire of the censer and the dull and lifeless state of Taylor's own soul. The same alternating pattern and the same typical identification also structure "The Ebb and Flow." "The images of the altar, censer, incense, and offerings" are not, as Mindele Black suggests, "strange . . . in a Puritan context," nor do they evoke a "curiously Catholic response. . . ."[22] Such imagery occurs in every Protestant typological study, for the references are to Jewish ceremonial worship and utensils and not to "popish practices." Samuel Mather, for example, develops twelve major parallels between Christ's priestly office and the golden censer which stood on the Altar of Incense (pp. 400ff.).

In Taylor's poetry and sermons, then, the use of the typical event, in the light of the traditions discussed in previous chapters, undergoes two significant modifications. First, in the face of almost universal Protestant and Puritan condemnation, Taylor adopts specific interpretations found only in Origen, and openly defends Origen's Christology. It was not unusual for Puritans to utilize Patristic and Scholastic interpretations when they suited their purposes; Samuel Mather cites from both Aquinas and Origen to support cherished Puritan doctrines. Yet, no Protestant typological study utilizes the specific typical images which Taylor adopts from Origen. One should not conclude, however, that Taylor's poetry was therefore unorthodox, and that he would not allow it to be published for that reason. It is more likely that Taylor is simply more candid than his typological predecessors. Although Origenistic allegory had been widely condemned in relation to typical interpretation, leading as it did to exegetical subjectivism, allegorical interpretation, related solely to the framework of the Testaments, was a widespread and orthodox typological method. Moreover, although typical identifications vary little from typologist to typologist, a certain amount of individual interpretative latitude was always present. Before Taylor, for example, only Samuel Mather had identified the golden trumpets used to summon the congregation to worship in the Temple as types of the Apostles "trumpeting" the good news. In addition, the numerous allegorical interpretations of Canticles and the Book of Revelations had been a part of Protestant thought since Luther's commentaries; although restricted largely to these two books, and never confused with typology, such commentaries allowed as much, or nearly as much, latitude as Origenistic allegory. Taylor may have simply been convinced of the validity of applying a widespread and orthodox Protestant exegetical method to typological interpretation. In any case, the question is a matter of degree, not of kind.

---

[22] "Edward Taylor: Heavens Sugar Cake," New England Quarterly (June, 1956), XXIX, 175-176.

Most striking, however, is the intense personal nature of Taylor's typology. At times, Taylor seems to obliterate the centuries which stand between himself and the typical event; in his better poems, he becomes so closely identified with the typical occurrence, and his longing for spiritual regeneration becomes so insistent, that he invests the type with a reality which is not found in any other commentator. Types find their fullness in Christ; in Him they cease, as Taylor asserts on several occasions.[23] Yet Taylor often asks for a "sign," a new typical revelation, which, however shadowy, will reveal the fullness of the glorified Christ. Meditation 60 [B], for example, one of Taylor's finest typical poems, compresses into the subdued final stanza the restrained request for personal purification. Based upon the typical identification of the rock in the wilderness, Taylor's allusions in the last stanza are as complex as in any series of typological parallels, yet are so unobtrusive as to pass almost unnoticed:

Lord, oynt me with this Petro oyle. I'm sick.
    Make mee drinke Water of the Rock. I'm dry.

---

[23] See, for example, Sermon IX, Christographia, p. 290.

> Me in this fountain wash. My Filth is thick.
> I'm faint, give Aqua Vitae or I dy.
> If in this stream thou cleanse and Chearish mee
> My Heart thy Hallelujahs Pipe shall bee (p. 190).

Each liquid image of typology is alluded to in this single stanza. The "Petro oyle," is the water from the rock. On the other hand, the fluid from the rock is, typically, Christ's blood which is a seal of the covenant; moreover, Hebrew priests and kings were anointed ("oynt") with oil, ordinarily by the prophets, and consecrated to their holy tasks. Typically, however, Christ assumes as His divine prerogative all priestly, kingly, and prophetic functions. His ministers, then, are also anointed as servants of the Most High; it is their consecration which qualifies them as messengers (apostoloi) of the Gospel. Such typical allusions inform line 2 as well, for the water of the rock is a type of Christ's blood shed on Calvary, and hence a type of the wine of the Supper which only His anointed may administer. Consecrated by the oil, the minister is "made" pure enough to "sup with Him."

Line 3 continues the typical imagery, but the focus is extended from the liquid of the Supper to the liquid of the second ordinance, baptism. The water from the rock, because it refreshed and quelled the rebellious Israelites, is also a type of baptism. Moreover, when Moses smites the rock, he reminds the Israelites that God had prepared a passage for them through the Red Sea, saving them from the pursuing hosts of Pharoah; hence, the line looks back to their previous salvation through water, and possibly, to the eight souls saved from the Deluge in Noah's ark. Moreover, the line also points forward to the brazen laver of the Temple, which is also a type of baptismal cleansing, for each priest (minister) of God was required by ceremonial law to cleanse himself before he entered the Temple to perform his duties. Finally, the line may also allude to those faithful who, in the Book of Revelations, appear before the throne of God, washed in the blood of the Lamb, the final reward for a regenerate life which begins in baptism. The image of baptism is continued in the next line, although the imagery shifts on a secondary level to another "crossing by water." Primarily, the line refers back to the water, the "Aqua Vitae," which gushes from the rock. In previous stanzas, however, Taylor has introduced the term "River," and he alludes in the fifth line to the "stream" which cleanses. Baptism is also typed by the crossing of the River Jordan, for it is the beginning of the march of the Hebrew people to the Promised Land; it is quite likely that Taylor is also alluding to the "Aqua Vitae" of the River, for Joshua crossed the Jordan, Christ was baptised in the Jordan, and every Christian must ultimately cross the final Jordan.

Moreover, golden trumpets were sounded before the offerings of sacrifice in the Temple; after Joshua's crossing of the Jordan, the people gained entrance into a city by the sounding of trumpets; when the Book of Life is opened in Heaven, the sounding of trumpets will precede the reading of the names inscribed therein. Taylor's last couplet summarizes, then, the images of the previous four lines:

> If in this stream thou cleanse and Chearish mee
> My Heart thy Hallelujahs Pipe shall bee.

Taken within context of the total poem, there are numerous other typical allusions as well; in addition, there are images in the poem which have implications apart from typology. This analysis has focused only on the typologically-related imagery. Moreover, none of these typical identifications is unique with Taylor; what is unique, however, is that Taylor has made them his own. The result is a symbology which is as vital and as intense as in any poet.

Although Jonathan Edwards' specific debt to his typological predecessors is difficult to document, his typological interpretations are quite traditional; they occur primarily in two relatively minor works: _The History of Redemption_ and the _Images or Shadows of Divine Things_. One should add, however, that the two works are markedly different; _The History_ is organized around the major typical ages of the Old Testament. In its own way, it is Samuel Mather's typological study limited primarily to a theory of history. On the other hand, the *Images or Shadows* is only peripherally related to traditional typology; although Edwards uses the conventional terminology, he significantly modifies, and quite consciously, the meaning of typical vocabulary. In fact, in the *Images or Shadows*, Puritan typology is used only as means for justifying a broader symbolic vision of the natural universe. In the process, viewed in light of the traditions discussed in this study, typology ceases to exist. Moreover, unlike the Reformers, and unlike Samuel Mather and Edward Taylor, the historical traditions of typology seem to have been of relatively minor importance to Edwards. One looks in vain for typical identifications in the sermons and treatises or for acknowledgement of the typological studies of the Church Fathers or the Reformers: such references do not occur. In surveying Edwards' background of reading, Thomas H. Johnson identifies references to Calvin's *Institutes*, to Solomon Glassius' *Philologia Sacra*, and to Poole's *Synopsis*; in each case, however, these are minor and are not related to typological interpretations.[24]

---

[24] Thomas H. Johnson, "Jonathan Edwards' Background of Reading," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* (Boston: 1931), XXVIII, 206ff.

In a series of notebook entries, apparently listing books which he intended to read, Edwards listed Philo, Tertullian, Eusebius, and Augustine, although, as Perry Miller points out, there is no specific evidence to indicate that Edwards knew any of Augustine's work.[25] None of the major typological studies, which even Edward Taylor possessed, is referred to by Edwards; nor is there any evidence that he was particularly interested in them, even in the excerpted form in Poole's Synopsis. This is not to say that Edwards was not widely read; it is to suggest, however, that his interest in typology was relatively minor, and then only as the type-antitype construct provided the basis for a broader symbolic theory.

In The History of Redemption, for example, the one work most closely related to traditional typology, Edwards views history in relation to three major epochs, of which only the first is related to typology proper. The first period extends from the Fall of Man to Christ's Incarnation; the second, from the Incarnation to His Resurrection; and the third, from His Resurrection to the end of the world.[26] Typology is the organizing principle of the first period; Edwards uses the major typical leaders of the Old Testament as medieval historians had used them to define the Six Ages of Man, to define the six major epochs in Hebrew History: from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, and then to Moses, to David, to the Captivity, and, finally, to the Return and Incarnation.[27] Within this framework, Edwards repeats the traditional typical identifications: Enoch, Noah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Samson, Joshua, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, and so on. As in the case of previous typologists, Edward interprets Jewish ceremonial observances as types of Christ's sacrifice and the worship of the church: "Typical laws, in which I suppose to be included most of those precepts which are given by Moses . . . , [are] those laws commonly called 'ceremonial.'"[28] In relation to Exodus typology, he

---

[25] Perry Miller, "Introduction," Images or Shadows of Divine Things (New Haven: 1948), p. 27. Subsequent citations refer to this edition.

[26] For a recent analysis of Edwards' History, see Peter Gay, A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in

---

Colonial America (Berkeley: 1966), pp. 88-117. For a more sympathetic appraisal of Christian historiography, see C. A. Patrides, The Phoenix and the Ladder (Berkeley: 1964).

[27] The History is, like Mather's The Figures or Types, a series of sermons (preached in 1739) which Edwards later intended to expand into a full History of the Work of Redemption, "a body of divinity in an entire new method, being thrown into the form of a history . . ." (see the letter "To The Trustees of the College of New Jersey at Princeton," in Jonathan Edwards: Representative Selections, ed. Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson [New York: 1962], p. 410).

[28] The History of Redemption, ed. David Austin (New York: 1793), p. 175. Subsequent references refer to this edition.

identifies the typical significance, in a completely traditional way, of the crossing of the Red Sea, the rock, the pillar and cloud, manna, the brazen serpent, the battle with the Amalekites,

> . . . and so innumerable other things might be mentioned, wherein the things they meet with were lively images of the things which the church and saints meet with in all ages of the world. That these were typical things . . . is manifest from I Cor. x.11 (p. 181).

Edwards' identifications are so similar to Mather's that one might suppose he knew The Figures or Types; it is also possible that Edwards used a number of Protestant studies, or that he simply created his own interpretations based upon the general subject of "a history of redemption." Several statements are more closely related to Calvin than to Mather; Edwards, for example, follows Calvin in assigning Christ's mediatorial work to the Old Testament: "As soon as man fell, Christ entered on his mediatorial work" (p. 64). He also repeats Calvin's statements concerning the "childhood" of the Church in the Hebrew dispensation: "The Church, under the Old Testament, was a child under tutors and governors . . ." (239), a view which is also found in Mather and other typologists. In lieu of explicit acknowledgement, specific indebtedness cannot be established; Edwards, however, does not present any typical interpretations which are not found in earlier studies. What makes Edwards' History slightly different from previous typological studies is not specific interpretations, but the emphasis which he places on types as stages in the long history of God's redemptive plan in Christ:

> . . . From what has been said, we may see that Christ and his redemption are the great subject of the whole Bible. Concerning the New Testament the matter is plain; and by what has been said on this subject hitherto, it appears to be also with respect to the Old Testament and his redemption is the great subject of the prophecies, as well as the Songs of the Old Testament; and the moral rules and precepts are all given subordination to him; and Christ and his redemption are also the great subject of the history of the Old Testament, from the beginning all along; and even the history of the creation is brought in as an introduction to the history of redemption which immediately follows it. The whole book, both the Old Testament and the New, is filled with the gospel; only with this difference, that the Old Testament contains the gospel under a vail, but the New contains it unvailed, so that we may say [see] this glory of the Lord with open face (pp. 306-307).

Such statements occur in all typological studies; Edwards is only more consistent in relating types to the history of redemption.

Traces of traditional typology appear in Images or Shadows, and it is clear that Edwards' creation of a symbolic view of nature is indebted to the type-antitype construct. Edwards gave various titles to the manuscript: "The Images of Divine Things," "The Shadows of Divine Things," "The Book of Nature and Common Providence," and

"The Language and Lessons of Nature."[29] When he edited the manuscript in 1948, Miller combined the first two of the possible four titles; the manuscript has since been known as the _Images or Shadows of Divine Things_. Such a title is a misnomer, however, for it implies that the book has a close relation to typology, reflecting Miller's thesis that in the _Images_ Edwards was attempting to rehabilitate typology as an antidote to the "vulgar" (Miller's term) spiritualizing of such works as John Flavel's _Husbandry Spiritualized_ and Cotton Mather's numerous imitations of Flavel, epitomized in the "tedious spiritualizing" of _Agricola, or the Religious Husbandman_. The fact that Edwards listed four possible titles, two of which are specifically related to the traditions of typology, and two of which are explicit references to the pietistic work of Flavel and Mather, would suggest that Edwards' plan for the Images changed several times. Moreover, in light of the work itself, one can demonstrate that "The Language and Lessons of Nature" is the more appropriate title, for the Images is not an attempt to "clarify the types," nor are the entries related in any significant way to the historical traditions of typology. Edwards' work is in the tradition of Flavel and Mather, Miller notwithstanding.

---

[29] Unfortunately, no detailed description of the manuscript is provided by Miller in his edition. H. G. Townsend presents a brief description in "Jonathan Edwards' Later Observations of Nature," _New England Quarterly_ (September, 1940), XIII, 510-518. Neither critic, however, attempts to determine different characteristics of the handwriting, different qualities of paper, etc., which would be of some help in dating the various entries. Townsend suggests that Edwards probably began the collection shortly after he "took up his work as minister in Northampton in 1727" (p. 512), and continued to make entries until sometime in the 1750's. Miller notes only that "the handwriting indicates that the notations were made, with different pens and inks, throughout his [Edwards'] life" (p. 1). For reasons discussed in this chapter, I would suggest that the manuscript was begun sometime in 1739 or 1740, the year Edwards preached the series of sermons on the history of redemption, and that he continued to work on it until his death, when, according to his letter to the Trustees of the College of New Jersey (Princeton), he was apparently still working on a revised version of the sermon series.

The two titles, "The Images of Divine Things," and "The Shadows of Divine Things," had been explicitly associated with typology as early as Origen, whose association of "image" and "shadow" is simply the result of bringing together two typological scriptural passages: "the shadows of things to come" (Col. 2: 17), and "the typos of Him that was to come" (Rom. 5: 14).[30] Origen translates typos as "image," uniting the two terms in a single phrase in the Commentary on Matthew: "The ancient liturgy contained images and shadows. . . ."[31] The phrase subsequently appears in numerous Patristic commentators; it is also common in Calvin,[32] and Samuel Mather uses "images or shadows" as an alternate "title" for his Figures or Types. Hence, to call the more than 200 entries "Images or Shadows" is to relate them specifically to the historical traditions of typology and to disassociate Edwards' work from the "tedious spiritualizing" of a Cotton Mather. The fact is, however, that traditional typical identifications occur in only nine of the 212 entries; moreover, as Edwards makes clear in the Images itself, and in another notebook, The Miscellanies, he is quite conscious of the fact that he is not "rehabilitating" typology. He is, in fact, discarding it. For, in relation to the typological traditions traced in this study, Edwards uses the term type in the limited historical sense of typos only in Images 5, 45, 52, 56, 58, 68, 73, 165, and 197. Paul's comparison of Christ's relation to the Church and the union of a man and woman in marriage is a "typical representation," as is the marriage of Adam and Eve (Images 5 and 56); the Tabernacle is a type of the Church, manna a type of the bread of the Supper, and Christ is the "true vine" from the stock of Jesse (Image 45); in Image 52, Edwards seems to be referring to the golden candlestick in the Temple as a type of Christ; the garments of the High Priest have typical significance (Image 58); manna and the image of the winepress typify the bread and wine of the Supper (Image 68); unclean animals are types of wicked men (Image 73); Abraham and David are types of Christ (Image 165); and the Jewish ceremonial rites and utensils all have typical significance (Image 197). Each of these typical identifications is also made in The History of Redemption; none of them is unique with Edwards: they are, in fact, the standard identifications in every typological study of the seventeenth century. Moreover, traditional typical identifications occupy a very minor part of the 212 entries. As an analysis of the Images makes clear, Edwards quite consciously extends the use of the term type to include such non-typological meanings as "illustrate," "exemplify," and "represent."

---

[30] Edward Taylor, for example, uses the citation from Colossians as the text for Meditation 1, Second Series, which presents his definition of types. The text from Romans is used in Meditation 3.

[31] Cited in Jean Daniélou, Origen (New York: 1955), p. 154.

---

[32] See, for example, Institutes of the Christian Religion, ed. John T. McNeill, The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: 1960), I, 453: a major "difference between the Old and New Testaments consists in figures: that, in the absence of the reality, it showed but an image and shadow in place of the substance." In light of the history of the phrase "Images or Shadows," Edward H. Davidson's analysis of the relation of typology to the Images, and particularly his suggestion as to the significance of the title, seems strangely uninformed: "'Images' were, for Edwards, the representations of truth--those eternal designs which God has fixed through all time. The 'shadows' may have been his own approaches down the long dark ways of consciousness which were still as alive and still as bewildering as they had ever been" (Jonathan Edwards: The Narrative of a Puritan Mind [Boston: 1966], p. 112).

In the first four Images, for example, Edwards selects common items from life and nature and points out their signification; the fact that "roses grow on briars" signifies that "all temporal sweets are mixt with bitter" (Image 3). The first actual typological identification appears in Image 5; although Edwards does not in this Image use typical terminology, he later refers to the same identification as a "typical mystery":

> Marriage signifies the spiritual union and communion of Christ and the church, and especially the glorification of the church in the perfection of this union and communion forever.

In Image 9, he returns to the same subject, using this time the terms of typology: ". . . we are expressly taught that there is a designed type of the union between Christ and the church." In Images 11 and 12, however, Edwards explicitly contrasts his approach to the traditional typological method, and, tentatively, presents the first intimation of a modification of typical terminology. "We are told," Edwards says, "that marriage is a great mystery, as representing the relation between Christ and the church." The mystery is "nothing but a type of what is spiritual." Edwards then asks the question which will ultimately lead to discarding traditional typology: "And if God designed this for a type of what is spiritual, why not many other things in the constitution and ordinary state of human society and the world of mankind?" In the next Image, Edwards answers his own question:

> Thus, I believe the grass and other vegetables growing and flourishing, looking green and pleasant as it were, ripening, blossoming, and bearing fruit from the influences of the heavens, the rain and wind and light and heat of the sun, to be on purpose to represent the dependence of our spiritual wellfare upon God's gracious influences and the effusions of His holy spirit. I am sure that there are none of the types of the Old Testament [that] are more lively images of spiritual things (p. 45).

One cannot say that the view of the material universe which Edwards introduces in this Image is unique with Edwards: it is as old as the Psalmist's assertion that "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork"; moreover, it is a view which was widely held in medieval Catholicism. St. Bonaventure, for example, says that a contemplation of God in nature is the second step in the process of mystical illumination:

> . . . with respect to the mirror of sensible things it happens that God is contemplated not only through them, as by His traces, but also in them, in so far as He is in them by essence, potency, and presence; . . . therefore a consideration of this sort holds next place as a second step in contemplation, by which we should be led to the contemplation of God in all creatures which enter into our minds through the bodily senses.[33]

One can say, however, that such a view is not the view of typology, and that Edwards himself is clearly aware that it is not. In Image 58, the distinction between traditional typology and Edwards' approach is explicitly stated.

---

[33] Saint Bonaventure, The Mind's Road to God, ed. George Boas (New York: 1953), p. 14.

In the Image, Edwards discusses the "beautifull variety of the colours of light" which were "designed as a type of the various beauties and graces of the spirit of God." In Miscellany 363, to which Edwards refers (and which Miller prints in conjunction with Image 58), Edwards clearly indicates that his reading of "types" is to be distinguished from biblical typology:

> . . . the whole outward creation, which is but the shadows of His being, is so made as to represent spiritual things. It might be demonstrated by the wonderful agreement in thousands of things, *much of the same kind as between the types of the Old Testament and their antitypes*; and by there being spiritual things being so often and continually compared with them in the word of God [italics added].

Contrary to Miller's position, which is clearly refuted by Edwards himself, this is not a "clarification of the types." It is an approach which is similar to the spiritual "shadowing forth" of types; it is not, however, typological. In the same context, Edwards indicates that he views everything in the Old Testament as typical, as did his predecessors:

> . . . almost everything that was said or done, that we have recorded in Scripture from Adam to Christ, was typical of Gospel things. Persons were typical persons; their actions were typical actions; the cities were typical cities; the

> nations of the Jews and other nations were typical nations; God's providences toward them were typical providences; their worship was typical worship; their houses were typical houses; their magistrates, typical magistrates, their clothes, typical clothes. . . .

Any of Edwards' Puritan predecessors in typology would not disagree with anything he states in this passage, although none had been quite so explicit. Yet, Edwards does not end where all typologists before him end; for Edwards continues the sentence to accommodate his own view: ". . . and indeed the world was a typical world."

Although this is the clearest statement of his position, it is implicit in most of the entries before Image 58. In Images 12 and 13, for example, Edwards indicates that "natural" images are as representative of God's mind as are the types of the Old Testament. And from that point on, Edwards uses the term _type_ in the sense of the "spiritual meaning of nature," divorcing it completely from the traditional relationship to the Old Testament, and using it in a sense which cannot be called typological. In Image 18, for example, women who suffer pain in childbirth are called a "type" of the spiritual pains of conversion; the silkworm is called a "remarkeable type of Christ" (Image 35); the gradual "progress . . . from childhood to manhood is a type of the gradual progress of saints in grace" (Image 42); the "rising and setting of the sun is a type of the death and resurrection of Christ" (Image 50); and so on. It is true that Edwards occasionally uses type in later Images in its limited signification; by Image 18, however, it is clear that traditional typology has provided Edwards a mode of expression only. Typical terms are not typical in the Images, or, more correctly, in "The Language and Lessons of Nature."[34]

---

[34] Edwards makes the same distinctions in The History of Redemption; Miller, however, fails to see them. Citing Edwards' definition of typology, Miller comments: "Spiritual truth is thus 'hidden' in the events . . ." (Images, p. 143, n45). Miller then uses "events" to mean "natural phenomena," which is not the meaning of the term in the context of Edwards' definition.

Miller's view of Edwards' work as an "immense cryptogram," fully developed in Jonathan Edwards (New York: 1949), is present in abbreviated form in the "Introduction" to the Images. The Images, "if studied sympathetically," Miller maintains, will "form a theme which is implied, sometimes deliberately veiled, in the published works" (p. 2). And he continues: "The manuscript lets us see his mind at work, fashioning and refining an idea, repeating and deepening it, from the first glimpses through successive moments of illumination to the last ecstatic cry when the words were thrown on the paper in an exclamation that defies the restraints of prose." That idea, according to Miller, is a "clarification of typology" through the grand synthesis which Edwards was able to produce between Locke and Newton, and Edwards' "doctrinaire Calvinism." In "The Modernity of Jonathan Edwards," Vincent Tomas has, conclusively it seems to me, demonstrated the error of Miller's approach (see the New England Quarterly [March, 1952], XXV, 60-84). Tomas asserts that Edwards' outlook is that of a "medieval, not a modern, philosopher" (p. 84). Robert C. Whittemore extends the criticism of Miller's view of Edwards, demonstrating that Edwards' view of epistemology is much closer to Aquinas than to Locke, and agreeing with Tomas that Edwards is closer to the medieval spirit than he is to modern philosophy (see "Jonathan Edwards and the Theology of the Sixth

Moreover, one need not posit a Lockean and Newtonian universe as Miller does,[35] as a basis for Edwards' position: two sources, both of which were in his library, can easily account for Edwards' emblematic view of nature. As has been pointed out in "The Development of Puritan Typology,"[36] unlike other Protestant typological studies, Solomon Glassius' Philologia Sacra discusses types as one of a number of figurative expressions used in the Bible. Types, in addition to simile, metaphor, metonymy, synechdoche, catachresis, hyperbole, and so on, are part of philologia sacra and must be understood as figurative expressions. Samuel Mather would have none of any position which made types a part of the "flowers of rhetoric":

Way," Church History [March, 1966], XXV, 60-75).

One need not agree with Peter Gay's judgment of Miller's view of Edwards ("absurd" and "simply perverse"); yet, Miller's view of typology, as it is presented in Roger Williams (see above, pp. 239ff.) and in the Images, is simply wrong. No matter how "sympathetically" one reads the Images, they do not support the ponderous theory of language which Miller finds in three or four relatively minor images. More to the point of this study, however, in the light of the historical traditions of typology, Miller cannot provide evidence for his claim of the uniqueness of Edwards' view of types, nor that Edwards set out to "clarify the types." Edwards' knowledge of typological traditions is the most limited of any typologist analyzed in this study. In relation to Edward Taylor's extensive study of typological works, for example, Edwards seems badly uninformed.

[35] See the "Introduction," Images or Shadows, pp. 19ff.

[36] See above, Chap. III, n88.

"they are not meer natural or arbitrary similitudes," for "God hath set no such Rule in the Art of Rhetorick, and if any Rhetoricians have done it, it is a mistake."[37] Even Benjamin Keach, Glassius' translator and editor, had insisted that types were not to be treated as figurative language, and he added a "Treatise of Types" to Glassius' work to make his position clear.[38] On the other hand, Edwards points out quite early in the Images, and in relation to typology, that many of the figurative expressions in the Bible refer to natural objects, and are used to express a spiritual meaning. In Image 15, for example, he notes that the "goodness of God . . . is in Scripture compared to a river"; in Image 26, he says that Christ often uses natural objects as "representations of spiritual things." And he continues: "These things are not merely mentioned as illustrations of his meaning, but as illustrations and evidences of the truth of what he says." In Image 45, however, Edwards asserts that "natural things were ordered for types of spiritual things . . . ," citing a number of figurative expressions in the Bible to justify his assertion. Unlike Glassius, who equates types with other biblical figures, Edwards makes types of all figurative expressions, most of which, as he notes, are related to nature. Edwards found in Glassius the relation of types to other figures of speech; he may also have concluded that typical terminology, as divinely instituted signs of God's actions in history (the view presented in The History of Redemption), could be used to include all figurative expressions found in the Bible; for the Scriptures themselves are inspired in the same manner that types are inspired. In any case, a Newtonian universe is not essential to account for Edwards' view of nature in the Images.

---

[37] The first part of this citation appears on p. 53; Mather returns to the relation of types and "the flowers of rhetoric" on pp. 128ff., in which the second part of my citation occurs.

[38] See above, pp. 37ff.; and Chap. III, n67.

Secondly, Lockean sensational psychology is no more necessary to understanding the Images than Newtonian physics; there were several traditions closer at hand which seem more clearly relevant to the actual Images than a postulated Edwards modernity. First, a number of the Images appear to be based upon the traditions of the Emblem books; Image 3, for example, "Roses grow upon briars, which is to signify that all temporal sweets are mixt with bitter," presents the same "moral" as George Whitney's emblem on the rose:

> So after paines, our pleasures make us glad,
> But without sower, the sweet is hardlie had.[39]

---

[39] For a discussion of Whitney's emblems, see above, pp. 197ff.

It is true that Edwards provides a specific Christian application, which is not found in Whitney; it is also true that he cites from Quarles in other works, that he probably also knew Withers, and that, in any case, he was familiar with the emblem traditions. Image 29 presents the familiar image of the Christian life as a struggle up a steep hill:

> When we travail up an hill, it is against our natural tendency and inclination, which is perpetually to descend. And therefore we go on ascending with labour and difficulty. But there arises a pleasant prospect to pay us for our labour as we ascend; and as we continue our labour in ascending, still the pleasantness of the prospect grows. Just so is man paid for his labour and self-denial in the Christian course.

Quarles develops the same metaphor more fully, yet the substance is the same as Edwards' Image. Quarles, however, seems to be more conscious of the snares of the world. If Pleasure, Honour, or Profit beckon, Quarles notes, "how fast and fearless do our footsteps flee." But "when our dull souls direct their thoughts to thee, / The soft-pac'd snail is not so slow as we." In the engraving, Quarles represents the "prize" of the faithful race at the top of the hill, and the citations from Augustine indicate that "labour and self-denial" receive their true rewards.[40]

---

[40] Francis Quarles, Emblems, Divine and Moral (London: 1839), pp. 47-49.

This is not to say that Edwards' Images are based upon specific emblems books; it is to point out, however, that a tradition with which he was familiar was readily available, and that many of his Images deal with the same subjects as dealt with in the emblem books.

Moreover, Edwards' _Images_ is not as markedly different from the traditions of Flavel and Cotton Mather as Miller asserts. Edwards owned Flavel's _Husbandry Spiritualized_, and he made ample use of it in the _Images_. Image 164, for example, explicitly refers to Flavel's work:

> For texts confirming observations that may be made, see innumerable places of Scripture representing spiritual things by things appertaining to husbandry, fields, vineyards, trees, corn, fruit, etc. See texts in Mr. Flavel's _Husbandry Spiritualized_.

Edwards may even have begun his own series because of Flavel's work; there are enough direct parallels to suggest that such may have been the case. In the prologue to _Husbandry Spiritualized_, Flavel justifies his "spiritualizing" of nature in terms which would have been quite acceptable to Edwards: "The life and employment of an husbandman excellently shadows forth the relation betwixt God and his church. . . ."[41] In addition to Edwards' direct reference to Flavel, several Images are developed in much the same manner as in Husbandry Spiritualized; both men have units on planting corn, on the lack of rain, on the necessity of rain and freezing, on winnowing, and so on. Tree imagery appeals to Edwards, and he devotes several Images to developing parallels with the Christian life:

---

[41] John Flavel, _Husbandry Spiritualized; or, the Heavenly Use of Earthly Things_ (London: 1734), p. 22. Subsequent page numbers refer to this edition.

> The first thing signified [by grafting] is the ingrafting the soul into Christ: in this Christ is the stock and the believer is the cyon or branch, who is cut out of its natural stock, taken out of the stock of the first Adam. . . . He is cut off from his own stock and root, emptied of himself . . . by the cutting work of the law and of repentence . . .(p. 112).

The same image in Flavel is as follows:

> When a twig is to be ingraffed, or a bud inoculated, it is first cut by a keen knife from the tree on which it naturally grew.
>
> And when the Lord intends to graff a soul into Christ, the first work is the cutting work. . . . No soul is united to Christ without a cutting sense of sin and misery (p. 207).

Moreover, Flavel often cites Glassius' Philologia Sacra as the source of his "spiritualized" nature, a reference which would not be lost on Edwards. In addition, in Agricola, or, The Religious Husbandman (Boston: 1727), Cotton Mather adopts Flavel's techniques, developing many of the same parallels which are also found in the Images. As a matter of fact, typology itself contributes to the "spiritualizing" of Flavel and Mather, for even in the

New Testament, as well as in subsequent typological studies, types are often presented solely as exempla. The "uses" drawn from any Puritan typological sermon, tenuously related as they are to historical typology, are not significantly different from the moralizing of Flavel and Mather. Even the relatively few traditional typical identifications in the Images are ordinarily related to moral conduct, further indicating that the work is more closely related to the traditions of Flavel and Mather than to the historical background of typology which underlies such works as Taylor's Meditations, for example. Edwards' Images is not identical, of course, to the work of Flavel and Mather; Flavel is urbane and cosmopolitan; Mather is verbose and somewhat dull; and Edwards is direct and incisive. Some parallels which are fully developed in Flavel and Mather receive only passing notice in the Images; on the other hand, Edwards occasionally develops parallels more fully than either Mather or Flavel. Finally, Edwards' approach is bookish and intellectual; Mather and Flavel are popularizers. Moreover, Edwards' Calvinism is never far below the surface; in more than twenty Images, nature renders an explicit Calvinistic doctrine:

> A tree that has so many branches from one stock and root, and from so small a seed and little twig, that gradually increases. . . , is a lively image of the church of God. . . . The various changes of the different seasons, and what comes to pass in

> its leaves, flowers, and fruit . . . is a lively image of what is to be seen in the church. The ingrafting of a tree, and the various things done about it by the husbandman, also represent what is to be seen in the church. . . . A tree also is in many ways a lively image of a particular Christian.
>
> Corol[lary]: Hence it may be argued that infants do belong to the church (pp. 88-89).

It is a mistake to imply that Edwards "chastizes the tropes" of such writers as Flavel and Mather; his methods are too similar to provide grounds for the assertion that he attempts to revolutionize Puritan rhetoric.

Whether or not Edwards' *Images*, or the impulse that produced them, had any significant influence on nineteenth century American authors, as Perry Miller and Ursula Brumm suggest,[42] is still perhaps a matter for critical dispute. One should note, however, that the Images were not published until 1948, and that if there is any such influence, it more than likely comes from the traditions which are represented by the Emblem writers, and such men as Flavel and Mather. Moreover, the ultimate source for such works as the *Images*, *Husbandry Spiritualized*, and *Agricola* is a religious temperament which revived typology, and which, by its insistence on the "spiritual nature" of Old Testament history, created a milieu in which God's design could be transferred from His Word to His works. And when this happened, typology ceased to exert the fascination on the human mind which had captivated earlier generations. From the beginning, typology invited its own destruction, for types required a mind attuned to biblical correspondences and committed to searching for biblical truth. Given the collapse of a world view which restrained the typologist solely to religious subjects, as had happened in the early Renaissance, typology, in its historical framework, ceased to be a defensible method of viewing the reality of God. Edwards, perhaps, sensed this, and turned from typology to the "spiritual" reality of the external world, as Edward Taylor before him had moved from the Exodus wilderness to the sensuous garden of Solomon. In any case, typical theory subsequently became the sole property of religious literalists, lingering on only in the sad products of fundamentalist apologetics. Yet, in its broader aspects, typology remains an enduring heritage--in the mosaics of St. Maria Maggiore, the sculptures of Chartres, the stained glass windows of Canterbury, and in the poetry of Edward Taylor.

---

[42] See especially Miller's essay, "From Edwards to Emerson," *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1964), pp. 184-203. That Puritan aesthetics influenced nineteenth century American writers, particularly Emerson, Hawthorne, and Melville, is the central thesis of Miss Brumm's *Die Religiöse Typologie im Amerikanischen Denken*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Ames, William. *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*. London, 1638.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 14 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1956.

The Apostolic Fathers. Translated by Edgar J. Goodspeed. New York, 1950.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Basic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Edited by Anton C. Pegis. 2 vols. New York, 1965.

———. *St. Thomas Aquinas: Theological Texts*. Edited by Thomas Gilby. Oxford, 1955.

Augustine, St. *Basic Writings of St. Augustine*. Edited by Whitney J. Oates. 2 vols. New York, 1948.

———. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Translated by John K. Ryan. New York, 1960.

———. *Selected Sermons of St. Augustine*. Translated by Quincy Howe, Jr. New York, 1966.

The Bay Psalm Book. Edited by Zoltan Haraszti. Chicago, 1965.

Biblia Pauperum. Edited by H. Th. Musper. Munich, 1961.

Bonaventure, St. *Breviloquim*. Edited by Erwin Esser Nemmers. St. Louis, 1947.

———. *The Mind's Road to God*. Edited by George Boas. New York, 1953.

———. *The Mystical Vine: A Treatise on the Passion of our Lord*. Translated by A Friar of S. S. F. London, 1955.

Bradford, William. "A Descriptive and Historical Account of New England in Verse," *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston: 1810), III, 77-84.

______. *History of Plymouth Plantation: 1620-1647*. Edited by Worthington C. Ford. 2 vols. Boston, 1912.

Brightman, Thomas. *A Revelation of the Revelation that is the Revelation of St. John*. Amsterdam, 1615.

Calvin, John. *Calvin's Commentaries*. 45 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1948-1956.

______. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1960.

______. *Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1958.

Cocceius, Johannes. *Summa Doctrinae de Foedere et Testamento Dei*. Leyden, 1648.

______. *Summa Theologiae ex Scripturis Repetita*. Geneva, 1665.

Cotton, John. *A Brief Exposition of the Whole Book of Canticles*. London, 1642.

De Montenay, Georgette. *A Booke of armes, or remembrance, wherein ar one Hundred Godly Emblemata* . . . Frankfort, 1619.

Edwards, Jonathan. *The History of Redemption*. Edited by David Austin. New York, 1793.

______. *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*. Edited by Perry Miller. New Haven, 1948.

______. *Jonathan Edwards: Representative Selections*. Edited by Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson. New York, 1962.

The English Hexapla: Exhibiting the Six Important English Translations of the New Testament Scriptures. London, 1850.

Flavel, John. *Husbandry Spiritualized; or, the Heavenly Use of Earthly Things*. London, 1734.

Glassius, Salomon. *Philologia Sacra*. Jena, 1623-1636.

Guild, William. *Moses Unvailed: or Those Figures which served unto the patterne and shaddow of heavenly things*. London, 1620.

Hilary, St. *The Trinity*. Translated by S. McKenna. New York, 1954.

Johnson, Edward. *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour in New England: 1628-1651*. Edited by J. Franklin Jameson. New York, 1910.

Keach, Benjamin. *Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors and Types*. London, 1681.

Luther, Martin. *Luther: Early Theological Works*. Edited by James Atkinson. Philadelphia, 1962.

———. *Luther's Works*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann. 55 vols. Philadelphia, 1960.

Mather, Cotton. *Agricola, or, The Religious Husbandman*. Boston, 1727.

———. *Magnalia Christi Americana: or, the Ecclesiastical History of New-England*. 2 vols. New York, 1967.

Mather, Samuel. *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament*. London, 1673.

Morton, Nathaniel. *New England's Memorial*. Boston, 1826.

The New Testament in the Original Greek. Edited by Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. New York, 1953.

The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First and Second Series. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 28 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1954.

Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge, 1953.

———. *On First Principles*. Edited by G. W. Butterworth. New York, 1966.

_______. *Prayer and Exhortation to Martyrdom*. Translated by John J. O'Meara. London, 1954.

_______. *The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies*. Translated by R. P. Lawson. London, 1957.

Patrologiae Graeca. Edited by J. P. Migne. 61 vols. Paris, 1859.

Patrologiae Latina. Edited by J. P. Migne. 122 vols. Paris, 1886.

Peacham, Henry. *Minerva Britanna, or a Garden of Heroical Devises*. London, 1612.

Perkins, William. "A Treatise of the Vocations or Callings of Men," *Puritan Political Ideas: 1558-1794*. Edited by Edmund S. Morgan. Indianapolis, 1965. Pp. 35-59.

Poole, Matthew. *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque de scripturae interpretum*. Amsterdam, 1669-1676.

Quarles, Frances. *Emblems, Divine and Moral*. London, 1635.

_______. *Hieroglyphikes of the Life of Man*. London, 1638.

Taylor, Edward. *The Diary of Edward Taylor*. Edited by Francis Murphy. Springfield, Massachusetts, 1964.

_______. *Edward Taylor's Christographia*. Edited by Norman S. Grabo. New Haven, 1962.

_______. *Edward Taylor's Treatise Concerning the Lord's Supper*. Edited by Norman S. Grabo. Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

_______. *The Poems of Edward Taylor*. Edited by Donald E. Stanford. New Haven, 1960.

_______. *The Poetical Works of Edward Taylor*. Edited by Thomas H. Johnson. Princeton, 1966.

Taylor, Thomas. *Moses and Aaron, or the Types and Shadows . . . Opened and Explained*. 2nd. Edition. London, 1653.

Tertullian, St. Tertullian's Homily on Baptism. Edited by Ernest Evans. London, 1964.

Thynne, Francis. Emblemes and Epigrames. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. London, 1876.

Twelfth-Century Homilies in MS. Bodley 343. Edited by A. O. Belfour. Oxford, 1962.

Tyndale, William. A briefe declaration of the sacraments. London, 1548.

_______. The Work of William Tyndale. Edited by G. E. Duffield. 2 vols. Appleford, Berkshire, 1964.

Willet, Andrew. Sacrorum Emblematum Centuria Una. Cambridge, n. d.

Wilson, Thomas. A Christian Dictionary, Opening the signification of the chiefe wordes dispersed generally through Holie Scriptures. London, 1611.

Winthrop, John. Winthrop Papers. Edited by Steward Mitchell. 2 vols. Boston, 1931.

_______. Winthrop's Journal: History of New England, 1630-1649. Edited by James Kendall Hosmer. 2 vols. New York, 1908.

Wither, George. A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne. London, 1635.

Wyclif, John. The English Works of Wyclif. Edited by F. D. Matthew. London, 1880.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books

Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. Edinburgh, 1953.

Aldridge, Alfred Owen. Jonathan Edwards. New York, 1966.

Allen, Don Cameron. *The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, and Letters.* Urbana, Illinois, 1949.

Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther.* Philadelphia, 1966.

Arnold, Hugh, and Lawrence B. Saint. *Stained Glass of the Middle Ages in England and France.* London, 1913.

Aubert, Marcel. *French Cathedral Windows of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.* Oxford, 1947.

Auerbach, Erich. *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature.* New York, 1959.

Bainton, Roland H. *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.* London, 1953.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of Reconciliation.* Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburgh, 1956.

Battis, Emery. *Saints and Sectaries: Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomian Controversy in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.* Chapel Hill, 1962.

Biographie Universelle: Ancienne et Moderne. 18 vols. Paris, 1843.

Blayney, Ida Walz. *The Age of Luther: The Spirit of Renaissance-Humanism and the Reformation.* New York, 1957.

Boas, George. *The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo.* New York, 1950.

Bougerol, J. Guy. *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure.* Translated by José de Vinck. Patterson, N.J., 1964.

Brumm, Ursula. *Die Religiöse Typologie im Amerikanischen Denken.* Leiden, 1963.

Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century: 1600-1660.* Oxford, 1945.

Charity, A.C. Events and Their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante. Cambridge, 1966.

Chew, Samuel C. The Virtues Reconciled: An Iconographic Study. Toronto, 1947.

Clebsch, William A. England's Earliest Protestants: 1520-1535. New Haven, 1964.

Clements, R. E. Prophecy and Covenant. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 43. London, 1965.

Cochrane, Charles Norris. Christianity and Classical Culture. Oxford, 1944.

Cook, G. H. The English Cathedral through the Centuries. London, 1957.

Cornell, Henrik. Biblia Pauperum. Stockholm, 1925.

Cragg, G. R. From Puritanism to the Age of Reason. Cambridge, 1950.

Daniélou, Jean. From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers. Westminster, Maryland, 1960.

_______. Origen. Translated by Walter Mitchell. New York, 1955.

Davidson, Edward H. Jonathan Edwards: The Narrative of a Puritan Mind. Boston, 1966.

Deanesly, Margaret. The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions. Cambridge, 1920.

De Jong, Peter Y. The Covenant Idea in New England Theology: 1620-1847. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1945.

The Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 14 vols. Oxford, 1921-1922.

Didron, Adolphe Napoleon. Christian Iconography: The History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages. Second edition. 2 vols. New York, 1965.

Emerson, Everett H. John Cotton. New York, 1965.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Works. 11 vols. Boston, 1886.

Erikson, Kai T. Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance. New York, 1966.

Fairbairn, Patrick. The Typology of Scripture, or The Doctrine of Types. First American Edition. Philadelphia, 1852.

Farrar, Frederic W. History of Interpretation. New York, 1886.

Feidelson, Charles, Jr. Symbolism in American Literature. Chicago, 1953.

Ferguson, George. Signs and Symbols in Christian Art. New York, 1966.

Fletcher, Angus. Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode. Ithaca, New York, 1964.

Ford, Worthington C. The Boston Book Market: 1679-1700. Boston, 1917.

Forstman, H. Jackson. Word and Spirit: Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority. Stanford, 1962.

Foster, Frank Hugh. A Genetic History of New England Theology. New York, 1907.

Freeman, Rosemary. English Emblem Books. London, 1948.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton, 1957.

Gay, Peter. A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America. Berkeley, 1966.

George, Charles H. and Katherine. The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation: 1570-1640. Princeton, 1961.

Gilson, Etienne. The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine. New York, 1960.

______. The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. New York, 1956.

Goodenough, Erwin R. An Introduction to Philo Judaeus. Oxford, 1962.

_______. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 12 vols. New York, 1953.

_______. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. London, 1935.

_______. *Religious Tradition and Myth*. New Haven, 1937.

Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: Die typologische des Alten Testaments im Neuen*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, No. 43. Guttersloh, 1939.

Grabo, Norman S. *Edward Taylor*. New Haven, 1961.

_______ (ed.). *Edward Taylor's Christographia*. New Haven, 1962.

_______ (ed.). *Edward Taylor's Treatise Concerning the Lord's Supper*. Lansing, Michigan, 1965.

Green, V. H. H. *Luther and the Reformation*. New York, 1964.

Greenlaw, Edwin. *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*. Baltimore, 1932.

Grodecki, Louis. *The Stained Glass of French Churches*. Paris, 1948.

Haller, William. *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. New York, 1955.

_______. *The Rise of Puritanism*. New York, 1938.

Hanning, Robert W. *The Vision of History in Early Britain*. New York, 1966.

Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. Richmond, Virginia, 1959.

Haraszti, Zoltan. *The Enigma of the Bay Psalm Book*. Chicago, 1956.

Harbison, E. Harris. *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation*. New York, 1956.

Harkness, Georgia. *John Calvin: The Man and His Ethics*. New York, 1931.

Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. Translated by Neil Buchanan. 7 vols. New York, 1958.

Haroutunian, Joseph. Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology. New York, 1932.

Harrison, Kenneth. The Windows of King's College Chapel, Cambridge: Notes on their History and Design. Cambridge, 1952.

Hastings, James (ed.). Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. 12 vols. New York, 1922.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. The Complete Novels and Selected Tales of Nathaniel Hawthorne. Edited by Norman Holmes Pearson. New York, 1937.

Honig, Edwin. Dark Conceit: The Making of Allegory. Evanston, Illinois, 1959.

Howard, Leon, and Louis B. Wright. Anglo-American Cultural Relations in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. Los Angeles, 1958.

Huppé, Bernard F. Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry. New York, 1959.

Hutter, Heribert. Medieval Stained Glass. New York, 1964.

Hyma, Albert. Renaissance to Reformation. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1951.

James, Montague R. The Verses Formerly Inscribed on Twelve Windows in the Choir of Canterbury Cathedral. Cambridge, 1901.

Jantz, Harold S. The First Century of New England Verse. New York, 1962.

Johnson, Clifton. Old-Time Schools and School-Books. New York, 1963.

Jones, Howard Mumford. O Strange New World: American Culture: The Formative Years. New York, 1964.

Jones, Rufus M. Studies in Mystical Religion. London, 1923.

Keyes, G. L. Christian Faith and the Interpretation of History: A Study of St. Augustine's Philosophy of History. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1966.

Knappen, M. M. Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism. Chicago, 1939.

Krouse, F. Michael. Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition. Princeton, 1949.

Lacroix, Paul. The Arts in the Middle Ages. New York, 1964.

Ladner, Gerhart B. The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers. Cambridge, Mass., 1959.

Levy, Babette May. Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History. New York, 1945.

Lowinsky, Edward Elias. The Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet. New York, 1946.

Ludwig, Allan I. Graven Images: New England Stonecarving and its Symbols: 1650-1815. Middletown, Connecticut, 1966.

Lundberg, Per. La Typologie baptismal de l'ancienne église. Acta Seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis. Leipzig, 1942.

Marriage, Margaret and Ernest. The Sculptures of Chartres Cathedral. Cambridge, 1909.

Martz, Louis L. The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century. New Haven, 1954.

McDonough, Thomas M. The Law and the Gospel in Luther. Oxford, 1963.

Milburn, R. L. P. Early Christian Interpretations of History. London, 1954.

Miller, Perry. Errand into the Wilderness. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

_______. Jonathan Edwards. New York, 1949.

_______. *Nature's Nation*. Cambridge, Mass., 1967.

_______. *The New England Mind*. 2 vols. New York, 1939.

_______. *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts: 1630-1650*. Boston, 1959.

_______, and Thomas H. Johnson (eds.). *The Puritans*. 2 vols. New York, 1938.

_______. *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition*. New York, 1953.

Milman, Henry Hart. *The History of Latin Christianity*. Second edition. 6 vols. London, 1857.

Morey, Charles R. *Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century*. Princeton, 1962.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*. Boston, 1958.

_______. *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*. New York, 1966.

_______. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*. Ithaca, New York, 1963.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England*. Ithaca, New York, 1960.

Mueller, William R. *John Donne: Preacher*. Princeton, 1962.

Murdock, Kenneth B. *Handkerchiefs from Paul, Being Pious and Consolatory Verses of Puritan Massachusetts*. Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

_______. *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England*. Cambridge, Mass., 1940.

Neue Deutsche Biographie. 8 vols. Berlin, 1957.

New, John F. H. *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*. Stanford, 1964.

Osgood, Herbert L. *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*. 2 vols. New York, 1904.

Ouwst, G. R. *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. Cambridge, 1933.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. New York, 1955.

______. *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. New York, 1939.

Parker, T. H. L. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1959.

Patrides, C. A. *The Phoenix and the Ladder: The Rise and Decline of the Christian View of History*. Berkeley, 1964.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. *The Continuity of American Poetry*. Princeton, 1961.

Perry, Ralph Barton. *Puritanism and Democracy*. New York, 1944.

Polman, A. D. R. *The Word of God According to St. Augustine*. London, 1961.

Powell, Sumner Chilton. *Puritan Village: The Formation of a New England Town*. New York, 1965.

Praz, Mario. *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery*. Second edition. Rome, 1964.

Putnam, George Haven. *Books and Their Makers During the Middle Ages*. 2 vols. New York, 1896.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Westminster, Maryland, 1962-1963.

Rackham, Bernard. *The Ancient Glass of Canterbury Cathedral*. London, 1949.

Réau, Louis. *Iconographie de l'art Chrétien*. 3 vols. Paris, 1956.

Reu, Johann Michael. *Luther's German Bible: An Historical Presentation Together with a Collection of Sources*. Columbus, Ohio, 1934.

Richter, Jean Paul, and A. Cameron Taylor. *The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art*. London, 1904.

Robertson, D. W., Jr. *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*. Princeton, 1963.

Rust, George. *A Letter of Resolution concerning Origen and the Chief of His Opinions*. London, 1661.

Rutman, Darrett B. *Winthrop's Boston: Portrait of a Puritan Town: 1630-1649*.

Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. 7 vols. New York, 1910.

Scherer, Wilhelm (ed.). *Die Septemberbibel: Das Neue Testament deutsch von Martin Luther*. Berlin, 1883.

Schneider, Herbert W. *The Puritan Mind*. New York, 1930.

Scholes, Percy A. *The Puritans and Music in England and New England*. Second edition. New York, 1962.

Schwarz, W. *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background*. Cambridge, 1955.

Schwiebert, E. G. *Luther and His Times*. St. Louis, Missouri, 1950.

Simpson, Alan. *Puritanism in Old and New England*. Chicago, 1955.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of The Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1952.

Sowers, Sidney G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews*. Basel Studies of Theology, No. 1. Zurich, 1965.

Stearns, Raymond Phineas. *Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands*. Chicago, 1940.

Stewart, Stanley. *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth Century Poetry*. Madison, Wisconsin, 1966.

Tavard, George H. *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation*. New York, 1959.

Taylor, Archer. Book Catalogues: Their Varieties and Uses. Chicago, 1957.

Townsend, Harvey G. The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards from His Private Notebooks. Eugene, Oregon, 1955.

Tuve, Rosemond. Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and Their Posterity. Princeton, 1966.

______. Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery. Chicago, 1947.

______. A Reading of George Herbert. Chicago, 1952.

Tuveson, Ernest Lee. Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress. Berkeley, 1949.

Tyler, Moses Coit. A History of American Literature: 1607-1765. New York, 1962.

Ullmann, C. Reformers Before the Reformation, Principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Translated by Robert Menzies. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1855.

Villette, Jean. Chartres and its Cathedral. London, 1963.

Wakefield, Gordon Stevens. Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety. London, 1957.

Walker, Williston. The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism. New York, 1893.

Wallace, Ronald S. Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1957.

Warren, Austin. The New England Conscience. Ann Arbor, 1966.

______. New England Saints. Ann Arbor, 1956.

Watson, Arthur. The Early Iconography of the Tree of Jesse. Oxford, 1934.

Wegener, G. S. 6000 Years of the Bible. New York, 1963.

Wendel, Francois. Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought. New York, 1950.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Epistle to the Hebrews. London, 1892.

White, Helen C. English Devotional Literature [Prose]: 1600-1640. Madison, Wisconsin, 1931.

Williams, Arnold. The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527-1633. Chapel Hill, 1948.

Winslow, Ola Elizabeth. American Broadside Verse. New Haven, 1930.

_______. Jonathan Edwards. New York, 1940.

_______. Samuel Sewall of Boston. New York, 1964.

Wischnitzer, Rachel. The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue. Chicago, 1948.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

Woodhouse, A. S. P. Puritanism and Liberty. Chicago, 1951.

Workman, Herbert B. John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church. 2 vols. Oxford, 1926.

Wright, Louis B., et. al. The Arts in America: The Colonial Period. New York, 1966.

_______. The Cultural Life of the American Colonies 1607-1763. New York, 1953.

Ziff, Larzer. The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience. Princeton, 1962.

2. Articles

Anderson, Wallace E. "Immaterialism in Jonathan Edwards' Early Philosophical Notes," Journal of the History of Ideas, XXV (April-June, 1964), 181-200.

Benton, Robert M. "Edward Taylor's Use of His Text," American Literature, XXXIX (March, 1967), 31-41.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. "New England Epic: Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*," *ELH*, XXXIII (September, 1966), 337-350.

_______. "Typology in New England: The Williams-Cotton Controversy Reassessed," *American Quarterly*, XIX (Summer, 1967), 165-191.

Black, Mindele. "Edward Taylor: Heavens Sugar Cake," *New England Quarterly*, XXIX (June, 1956), 159-181.

Blau, Herbert. "Heaven's Sugar Cake: Theology and Imagery in the Poetry of Edward Taylor," *New England Quarterly*, XXVI (March, 1953), 337-360.

Caplan, Harry. "The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching," *Speculum*, IV (July, 1929), 60-76.

Caswell, R. N. "Calvin's View of Ecclesiastical Discipline," *John Calvin: A Collection of Essays*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1966.

Chydenius, Johan. "The Typological Problem in Dante: A Study in the History of Medieval Ideas," *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, No. 1, XXV, 11-44. Helsingfors, 1958.

Clements, Robert J. "The Cult of the Poet in Renaissance Emblem Literature," *PMLA*, LIX (September, 1944), 672-685.

Dieckmann, Liselotte. "Renaissance Hieroglyphics," *Comparative Literature*, IX (Fall, 1957), 308-321.

Eichrodt, Walter. "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, Claus Westermann, editor. Richmond, Virginia, 1963. Pp. 224-245.

Emerson, Everett H. "Calvin and Covenant Theology," *Church History*, XXV (June, 1956), 136-144.

Frye, Northrop. "The Typology of *Paradise Regained*," *Modern Philology*, LIII (May, 1956), 227-238.

Grabo, Norman S. "Catholic Tradition, Puritan Literature, and Edward Taylor," *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters*, XLV (1960), 395-402.

________. "Edward Taylor on the Lord's Supper," *The Boston Public Library Quarterly*, XII (January, 1960), 22-36.

________. "Edward Taylor's Spiritual Huswifery," *PMLA*, LXXIX (December, 1964), 554-560.

________. "The Veiled Vision: The Role of Aesthetics in Early American Intellectual History," *William and Mary Quarterly*, XIX (Fall, 1962), 493-511.

Haight, Gordon S. "The Sources of Quarles's *Emblems*," *The Library*, 4th Series, XVI (September, 1934), 188-209.

Halbert, Cecelia L. "Tree of Life Imagery in the Poetry of Edward Taylor," *American Literature*, XXXVIII (March, 1966), 22-34.

Harris, Victor. "Allegory to Analogy in the Interpretation of Scripture," *Philological Quarterly*, XLV (January, 1966), 1-23.

Heimert, Alan. "Puritanism, the Wilderness, and the Frontier," *New England Quarterly*, XXVI (September, 1953), 361-382.

Hummel, Horace D. "The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation," *Biblical Research*, IX (1964), 38-50.

James, Montague R. "*Pictor in Carmine*," *Archaeologia*, XCIV (1951), 141-166.

Johnson, Thomas H. "Jonathan Edwards' Background of Reading," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXXVIII, 193-222. Boston, 1931.

Kehoe, Richard. "The Spiritual Sense of Scripture," *Blackfriars*, XXVII (July, 1946), 246-251.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Reasonableness of Typology," *Essays on Typology*. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22. Naperville, Illinois, 1957. Pp. 9-38.

Maclear, James Fulton. "'The Heart of New England Rent': The Mystical Element in Early Puritan History," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLII (March, 1956), 621-652.

Madsen, William G. "Earth the Shadow of Heaven: Typological Symbolism in _Paradise Lost_," _PMLA_, LXXV (May, 1960), 519-556.

Manierre, William R., II. "Verbal Patterns in the Poetry of Edward Taylor," _College English_, XXIII (January, 1962), 296-299.

Markus, R. A. "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture," _Church Quarterly Review_, CLVIII (1957), 442-451.

Martz, Louis L. "Foreward," _The Poems of Edward Taylor_. Edited by Donald E. Stanford. New Haven, 1960. Pp. xiii-xxxvii.

Morgan, Edmund S. "Introduction," _Puritan Political Ideas: 1558-1794_. Indianapolis, 1965. Pp. xiii-xlvii.

Murdock, Kenneth B. "Clio in the Wilderness: History and Biography in Puritan New England," _Church History_, XXIV (September, 1955), 221-238.

________. "William Hubbard and the Providential Interpretation of History," _Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society_, LII. Worcester, Mass., 1963. 15-37.

Murphy, Francis X. "An Edward Taylor Manuscript Book," _American Literature_, XXXI (May, 1959), 188-189.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. "Edward Taylor: The Poet as Puritan," _The New England Quarterly_, XXIII (March, 1950), 31-46.

Potter, Alfred Claghorn. "Catalogue of John Harvard's Library," _Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts_, XXI, 190-230. Cambridge, Mass., 1919.

Quinn, Dennis B. "John Donne's Principles of Biblical Exegesis," _Journal of English and Germanic Philology_, LXI (April, 1962), 313-329.

Rad, Gerhard von. "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," _Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics_, Claus Westermann, editor. Richmond, Virginia, 1963. Pp. 17-39.

Smalley, Beryl. "Stephen Langton and the Four Senses of Scripture," Speculum, No. 1, VI (1931), 60-76.

Smith, Alison Moore. "The Iconography of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Early Christian Art," American Journal of Archaeology, 2nd Series, XXVI (1922), 159-173.

Stanford, Donald E. "Edward Taylor and the Lord's Supper," American Literature, XXVII (March, 1955), 172-178.

_______. "Edward Taylor's Metrical History of Christianity," American Literature, XXXIII (November, 1961), 279-295.

_______. "Introduction," The Poems of Edward Taylor. New Haven, 1960. Pp. xxxix-lxii.

Tomas, Vincent. "The Modernity of Jonathan Edwards," New England Quarterly, XXV (March, 1952), 60-84.

Townsend, H. G. "Jonathan Edwards' Later Observations of Nature," New England Quarterly, XIII (September, 1940), 510-518.

Tuttle, Julius Herbert. "The Libraries of the Mathers," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, New Series, XX (April 20, 1910), 268-356.

Weathers, Willie T. "Edward Taylor and the Cambridge Platonists," American Literature, XXVI (March, 1954), 1-31.

Whittemore, Robert C. "Jonathan Edwards and the Theology of the Sixth Way," Church History, XXV (March, 1966), 60-75.

Woolcombe, K. J. "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," Essays on Typology. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22. Naperville, Illinois, 1957. Pp. 39-57.

Woolf, Rosemary. "The Effect of Typology on the English Mediaeval Plays of Abraham and Isaac," Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies, XXXII (October, 1957), 805-825.

Wright, Nathalia. "The Morality Tradition in the Poetry of Edward Taylor," American Literature, XVIII (March, 1964), 1-17.

VITA

Thomas M. Davis, born on a farm near Ashland, Kansas, on July 20, 1930, received his elementary and secondary schooling in various small towns in Kansas. Upon graduation from high school, he joined the U. S. Navy and was assigned to the Submarine Service. He was discharged in 1949, and, after a year in Manhattan Bible College, was recalled for Submarine Service during the Korean War. After various work in construction and farming, he attended Kansas State University, where he received the Bachelor of Science degree in 1957 and the Master of Science degree in 1959. During the next six years, Mr. Davis was an instructor of English at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. Mr. Davis is presently Director of General Studies in English at Southern Illinois University.